THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1860.

ART. I.—SKETCHES OF A TRAVELLER FROM GREECE, CONSTANTINOPLE, ASIA MINOR, SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

IX. HISTORY OF THE MODERN GREEK LANGUAGE AND POPULAR POETRY.

It seems to be a prevailing opinion in America that the Modern Greek as it is spoken and written at the present day by the three millions of Greeks in the Levant, is a totally distinct dialect from the classical language of the ancient Hellenes. Many of our literary men speak of it, as of a *Lingua Franca*, a medley of Turkish and Italian, a barbarous jargon, devoid of harmony and beauty and being, as they think, without a literature, is not worthy of the study or even the notice of the scholar. Yet this is an erroneous view which has its origin only in their not being sufficiently acquainted with the modern dialect. To this may be added some prejudices which we nourish against the Greek nation itself and a certain indifference on this otherwise interesting question or a shyness to go straightway into a thorough investigation of this subject by seriously and critically comparing the ancient and modern language with each other. Great has likewise been the outcry against the modern Greek pronunciation, though we think that every one must admit that it is far more harmonious, softer and partakes more of the nature and spirit of a Southern nation, than that long since introduced into the English Universities, and followed pretty generally in America. Among our prominent philologians there are

few who have made the modern Greek their study, and still fewer who have travelled in Greece and resided long enough at the University of Athens to adopt the pronunciation and spirit of the modern dialect and thus to be able to render an impartial judgment on this question.

Several of the German professors who lived with me in Greece have introduced it into the Universities of Germany, to which they returned after the revolutionary catastrophe of September, 1843.* So did the late lamented Dr. Lewis Ross in Halle, and Ernst Curtius in Göttingen. The same has been done by President Woolsey at Yale College and Prof. Felton at Harvard University in Cambridge, nor need I add that years ago my highly esteemed friend and colleague, Prof. W. M. Nevin, at Franklin and Marshall College, has adopted the true Greek pronunciation, and continually demonstrates to the students the importance of the modern Romaïc for the thorough study of the ancient Hellenic.† Should we now question the Greeks themselves, we would hear them denounce with one voice the presumption of the foreigners who, coming from a remote corner of the North, from regions unknown to their ancestors, pretend to teach the Greeks, the descendants of the Hellenes the proper pronounciation of their own mother tongue and they would add apparently with some justice: We can prove historically that our forefathers for a thousand and even twelve hundred years back have pronounced our language exactly as we do to this day. It belongs then to you, foreigners, likewise, to demonstrate on what grounds you suppose that your pronunciation of our language, which to our ears seems so barbarous, could have been of remoter antiquity than our own. During what period? by what revolutions has this

---

* See Mercersburg Quarterly Review, Vol. VI, 1854, page 465, et seq.

† From the time when Constantine adopted Christianity as a state-religion and built the Cathedral of Sancta Sophia in Constantinople, (A. D. 325), the Greeks in a religious significance call themselves *Romans*, Ῥωμαῖοι and their language, as the original tongue of the sacred Scriptures, Ῥωμαϊκὴ γλῶσσα Hence the words Ῥωμαῖος and Χριστιανός are synonymous. The modern dialect is likewise called ἡ σημερινή, or τωρινή (present) and ὁμιλουμένη or καθομιλουμένη (spoken) διάλεκτος. The Greeks call it likewise ἡ κοινὴ γλῶσσα, and their present purified written language ἡ ἁπλὴ Ἑλληνική, or *common Hellenic*.

change of accent and pronunciation taken place, which does not consist merely in the modulation of the voice or the variations of a dialect, but in harsh diphthongal sounds which it is quite impossible for a Greek organ to pronounce? Nay, the Greek will add, with a smile, "You yourselves, with your Anglo-Saxon organs, would not be able to speak that language which you read with so much difficulty and hesitation in the school." In this the Greeks certainly are right and there is some injustice on the part of the foreigner. For by merely opening some Romaïc or modern Greek book printed in the popular dialect a century ago in Venice or Vienna and finding some Turkish or Italian words mixed up with the Greek, an Hellenic scholar will shrug his shoulders and with a disdainful smile throw the book aside exclaiming, "Oh, what a barbarous jargon is the Romaïc." And yet he knows as little of the excellent works of Bulgaris, Theotokios and other Greek writers from the middle of the last century as of the late eventful history of the Greek nation and the astonishing development of their language which has within the last fifty years been restored to renewed freshness and beauty.

By this I do not, however, pretend to say that there is no difference in the style of the ancient and *modern Hellenic*—as the Greeks call their purified written language. The parts of speech as to their etymological structure are precisely the same now as they were three thousand years ago; but though there is no difference in the words, the modern language is not so copiously inflected nor so elliptically arranged with regard to the syntax as in the ancient Hellenic;—its structure follows more the easy flow of the Romanic languages, yet without losing either the character or the spirit of the mother tongue.

Such a modification, nay, total change in the very spirit of the idiom has taken place in the Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and French languages in their relations to the Latin of ancient Rome. But with regard to these modern Romanic languages, history clearly accounts for the general

perversion of the Roman tongue during the continual migrations and settlements of Northern and Eastern tribes in the dark ages that followed the overthrow of the Western Roman empire. Latin was lost as a living language as early as the sixth century—while, on the contrary, the Hellenic was spoken, and written by the learned and the nobles of Constantinople until the Turkish conquest in the fifteenth century; nay, the celebrated Italian Philelphus, who visited that capital a few years before the fall of the Byzantine empire, says expressly, "that the ordinary speech of the ecclesiastics, the courtiers and principally the ladies of Constantinople, was so pure and beautiful that it might have issued from the lips of Sophocles or Euripides, and even from Plato or Aristotle themselves."* Nor is this a mere compliment paid by a Florentine enthusiast to the Constantinopolitan ladies—it is a well known fact that woman in Greece, at a much earlier period, was remarkable for preserving the purity of her language, and Plato tells us that it was principally the Athenian women who so faithfully preserved the ancient pronunciation of Attica.

These authentic statements left us from the middle ages, compared with our own observations at the present day, may well enable us to assert that in reality there exists a far greater difference between the English spoken and written by Chaucer and the present English, than between the language of Demosthenes and that of Trikupis and of Asopios now of the University at Athens.

The all powerful influence of the dominion of the Ostrogoths, the Longobards, the Franks of Charlemain and

---

* In his letter from Constantinople to his friend John Argyropulos, in 1451 two years before the conquest of the city of Mohammed II., he says: "Viri aulici veterem sermonis dignitatem atque elegantiam retinebant: imprimisque ab ipsis nobilibus mulieribus, quibusqum nullum esset omnino cum viris peregrinis commercium, *merus illè ac purus Grecorum sermo* servabatur intactus." In the island of Sicily and in the south of Italy, both in Calabria and on mount Gargano the great bulk of the population was Greek in language and manners, and few portions of the Greek race had succeeded so well in preserving their wealth and property uninjured. The Greek language continued there in use until the fourteenth century. See Col. George Finlay's excellent work: *Greece under the Romans.* Edinburgh and London. 1844. page 515.

the German emperors in Italy, and that of the Svevi, Vandals, Visigoths and Arabs in Spain and Portugal, brought on a total mixture, both of different races and of their dialects—from which, at a later period of the Middle Ages, new nations and new languages arose on the ruins of the old.

Not so in Greece. For one thousand years after the down-fall of Western Rome—during the sway of the Byzantine emperors—Greece was invaded, as I have related in a former article†—but never entirely subdued by any foreign nation. The Greek race never melted away and lost itself—nor did the Avares, the Bulgarians, or the various Slavic tribes obtain any permanent settlement in Hellas. Even those Slavonian colonies, I mentioned as occuyping, during the eighth and ninth centuries, some parts of the Peloponnesus, were soon subdued, conquered, Christianized and Hellenized by the sword of the Emperor Basilius, the Macedonian, in the year 860, and from that time down to the conquest of Constantinople by the Othoman Turks in 1453, we find the Greeks existing as a nation. Even under the government of the Dukes of Athens and the sovereign Princes of the Morea, they still enjoyed their language and religion, and a participation in the feudal priviliges of the French Barons.

Yet these revolutions, and their intercourse with more barbarous tribes, such as the Slavonians, the Albanians and the haughty Crusaders, have undoubtedly left some traces behind them, which particularly in the syntax of the modern language constitutes its real and essential difference from the ancient mother tongue. This dissimilarity consists chiefly in a reduced form, or a simplification of the old forms of the language, and, if I may say so—in a more modern turn of thought, which often with good Hellenic words expresses the new ideas of a modern Christian people;

† See my description of the Slavonic Invasions in Peloponnesus in Mercersburg Quarterly Review, Vol. IX, 1857, page 407. My medieval history of Athens and northern Greece, will follow in another number next year.

but nevertheless retain the Hellenic character.‡ Yet in spite of these alterations, which already begin to vanish in the latest books published in Athens—I consider these barbarisms to have been brought about by the condition of the times, that does not essentially strike at the heart and root of the language, because all the treasures of the ancient Hellenic remain still the inexhaustible source from which the modern Greeks can enrich their own—while, at the same time, they are rejecting and banishing the intruded Turkish, Albanian or Italian words and expressions. What renders this reform more easy is that these foreign words, though suffered to remain in common use by the illiterate mass of the people during the centuries of subjection, have never obtained such an influence over the Greek dialect, as have for instance, the Gothic and Arabic over the Italian and Spanish languages.

Popular dialects, deviating more or less from the written language, existed already in antiquity; and in order to trace them to their origin, the inquirer would be obliged to go back to the most flourishing times of Hellenic literature. The language of the Apostles in the New Testament forms already a transition toward the more modern idiom.

The Princess Anna Comnena, the learned daughter of the Emperor Alexius Comnenos, in the eleventh century employed Romaïc words; she calls Bohemund the Crusader a *Pallikari* or a brave and handsome warrior.* Nay it was even later that a Greek monk called the Ptochoprodromos—the poor Forerunner—in the twelfth century became the first modern poet who wrote a Romaïc poem addressed to the Emperor Manuel Comnenos. From that

‡ Thus for instance do the present Greeks in daily conversation make use of an indefinite article (εἷς, μία, ἕν,); they rarely employ the dative case and supply its want by prepositions. From the Slavonians and Crusaders they have adopted the more frequent use of auxiliary verbs and compound tenses as in the modern languages, though they employ them less in their more elegant *written* language. The Greeks have likewise dropt the infinitive mood, as far back as the thirteenth century and substitute the conjunctive with νά (ἵνα). They have reduced the simple tenses of the verbs to the present, imperfect and aorist, seldom using the perfect; yet they retain the participles in their full variety of forms and express the future like the Anglo Saxons, and Danes by the auxiliaries *shall* or *will*—θέλω.

* The modern *Pallikari* or Παλληκάρι is the diminutive of the ancient Greek πάλλαξ, a handsome young fellow and παλλακίς, a sweet heart.

time the Byzantine historians began to write in a mixture of Hellenic and Romaïc and this dialect was after the fall of Constantinople used by the Ecclesiastics and learned Greeks and called *mixobárbaros*—while the language of the mass of the unhappy Greek nation during the Turkish dominion became more and more corrupt—through the intrusion of Turkish and Albanian words.

And yet the spirit and the body of this rough idiom remained truly Greek and it is a false supposition of superficial travellers that Slavonic, Albanian or Turkish is spoken by the modern descendants of the Hellenic race in Greece to the exclusion of their own.

I would therefore fearlessly compare the modern Greek language to an ancient Hellenic statue, which for many centuries had been buried in the bosom of the earth, but on its discovery,—though maimed and broken,—still presents the noble traits of antiquity and, placed in the hands of a skilful sculptor—might yet be restored to the beauty of a Medicean Venus.

During the last century different opinions prevailed in Greece with regard to this important restoration of the language. Some learned Hellenists, such as the venerable Neophytos Ducas and others, considered the vulgar dialect to be incapable of purification and they, therefore, wrote their voluminous works in a stiff and pedantic ancient Hellenic. But their labor was lost; their books were neither read nor understood. Others, taking the hint, like the lively poet Christópulos now began to exhort their countrymen to study their plain speech. They again went too far in another direction because they rejected all those Hellenic words and phrases which were not in common use, and published some curious books, without regard to etymology or orthography, thus putting a sudden stop to any future development of the popular language. But all in vain. The tender lyrical songs of Christópulos became the favorite airs to the guitar;—but his style was never imitated by succeeding poets; his barbarous orthography was dropt at once—and it was reserved for two patri-

otic men, the generous Rhigas and the learned Koraïs—to become the true regenerators of the Hellenic language.

Constantinos Rhigas, a native of Thessaly, was the founder of the patriotic society, the Hetaria, which twenty-five years later, in 1821, succeeded in uniting all the Greeks for the glorious delivery of Hellas. He was the enthusiastic *poet of liberty*, who in a pure and noble strain, composed those beautiful war-songs which thrilled the hearts of the Greeks from the banks of the Danube to the promontories of Morea and led them on to battle and victory. Hunted down by the Turks and betrayed by treacherous Austria, the noble-minded Rhigas was delivered into the hands of the Pasha of Belgrad, who, with cannibalian cruelty, in 1799, slaughtered the first martyr of regenerated Greece. But the happy reform which he had begun in the poetry of his native tongue survived, and was extended to its prose by the Adamantios Korais from Chios, who is regarded as the father of the new Hellenic language.

The purification of the vulgar dialect, which Korais now attempted, did not consist in introducing words and set phrases from the ancient language unintelligible to the mass and mixed up with the vulgar expressions of daily life. Such a medly, which Koraïs called ἡ μιξοβάρβαρος γλῶσσα or, the mixed barbarian dialect was then in fashion among the clergy and half-learned Greeks of Constantinople, the Phanariots,—and he most severely reprobated it as detrimental and quite contrary to the spirit of the Romaïc tongue.

"The design of these mixed Hellenizers"—said the worthy Koraïs—"is in itself laudable, because they strive, poor men, to bring the modern language as near as possible to its mother, the Hellenic. But since the first virtue of a writer is perspicuity, or to write in such a manner as to be well understood by those for whom he writes—and the second to write with elegance, which may give pleasure to the ear, I think that such Hellenizers have neither the one nor the other of those merits—who involve the ancient language in the most grotesque and ridiculous manner with

the modern syntax, and form out of the two an obscure, harsh, unharmonious and truly monstrous style of diction —a mere patch-work of phraseology."

Koraïs then gives a curious letter written in this compound of ignorance and pedantry—quite a dish of macaroni.

Such being the sound principles from which he started on his great reform and taking both the standard of education in Greece and the spirit and coloring of the modern Greek as his basis, he, by the most solicitous comparison of both dialects, the ancient and the modern—and by the nicest regard for the beauties of both, with good sense, taste and discrimination, adopted only such words and forms of the Hellenic as were indispensable for the modern language, in order to enrich and purify it, without changing its leading character. Only a man of such talents, of such profound learning, excellent judgment and amiable character as Koraïs, was able to undertake so herculean a work and to ensure its full success.

The whole nation soon hailed his laborious exertions with veneration and gratitude. His numerous works, written in an extremely pure and truly elegant language, were understood even by the illiterate, because they breathed the spirit of the people; they were expressed in a nobler, more perfect style, which elevated the minds of the Greeks and contributed more to their civilization and the exalted feeling of their nationality, than all the other political and commercial influences of the time.

Adamantios Koraïs, by profession a physician, lived retired at Paris, as a member of the French Institute, and highly honored by Napoleon, who charged him with the publication of new editions and translations of Strabo and Plutarch, and rewarded his labors with an honoray pension of 4,000 francs.

But being poor, Koraïs would have found an insurmountable difficulty in publishing and distributing his powerful exhortations to his suffering countrymen. He, therefore, in his modern Greek translation of Beccaria's celebrated

work on crimes and capital punishments, addressed himself to the wealthy and virtuous men of his country and said:

"Let all the rich and patriotic men of the Hellenic race unite for the name and love of our common mother-country and let them contribute each according to his power,—since Greece, being in misery and servitude, has no public treasury to support schools for the maintenance and instruction of her destitute youths. But unite quickly, while Greece has need of your assistance, if you wish to have the gratitude of Greece. True friends hurry to their friends' assistance in time of danger;—flatterers do not appear until the danger is over! Instead of repining at the expense for good and useful objects, you ought to thank the Providence of God for living in circumstances and in times, in which, by the superfluity of your wealth, laid out with prudence, you may gain immortal honors and be named the benefactors of Hellas, upon whom a new morn of light begins to dawn!"

These powerful words were published in 1802, nineteen years before the shout of liberty and victory began to recho from the mountains and valleys of Greece.

They were heard and understood by the two noble-minded brothers, Zozimades, rich merchants from Epirus, who had passed the greater part of their industrious career at Leghorn, in Italy, and at Moscow, in Russia—and they were the first to stand forward as the benefactors of the nation and help on its progress toward civilization. Many wealthy Greeks in London, Paris, Vienna, Trieste and Odessa afterwards followed their example. All the works of Koraïs and other modern authors of Greece, were published in Paris at the expense of the benevolent brothers, and distributed gratuitously all over Greece and Turkey.

Koraïs lived to enjoy the deliverance of his beloved native country. He died of old age, in Paris, in 1832.

The path was now opened and many were his followers yet it would have been wonderful indeed if Koraïs should have escaped the envy and jealousy of his rivals. He was

continually attacked by the learned Constantinos Koumas from Thessaly, and other Greek writers, who, during the wars of Napoleon, flocked to Vienna and Paris. They all accused the worthy Korais of a too modern French or Italian style of diction, which they pretended to be detrimental to the spirit of the Hellenic language. But all these clamors soon died away. Time has now sanctioned the correctness of the judgment and good taste of that benevolent man, and a comparison of their rough and affected language with his, would immediately prove the acute discrimination of the Greek nation, who have awarded to him the merit of being the founder of the written language of modern Hellas.

The world at large, both in Europe and America, beheld with astonishment the first fruits of this reform of a language, which was then hardly known to exist, in the manly and spirited proclamations of the Greek nation that in 1821 rose in arms to reconquer their independence, in the able and well written Constitutions of Argos and Troizen in 1823, in the famous funeral oration of Spiridon Trikupis at the bier of Lord Byron, and in the public edicts of Count Capo d' Istria, the first president of the new Hellenic kingdom.

The great work of Korais, the rational restoration of the Hellenic, was continued and extended with activity and excellent judgment by the learned Greeks after the ascension of King Otho on the throne of Hellas in 1833. The purification and completion of the language became an object of the highest importance to the Royal government, though at that time it still presented many difficulties. Among all other nations the development of the language and the introduction of scientific or technical terms follow gradually the successive progress of civilization. In Greece, on the contrary, with the sudden introduction of European institutions, laws, sciences and arts, thousands of terms and expressions, were immediately, either to be borrowed from the ancient Hellenic dictionary, or, on the principles of the classical language, to be formed and adapted to mod-

ern inventions, altogether unknown to the contemporaries of Pericles and Demosthenes.*

It was particularly in the military language that the beginning of this interesting reform was made, even during the war, by the learned Colonel Rhodios, and it was continued with great diligence at our Military College of the Euêlpides, where my friend and colleague, Captain Andreas Zabunzakis, from Crete, Professor of the Military Sciences, published a complete work on fortification, containing more than twelve hundred terms, laboriously gathered from Xenophon, Polybius, and other military authors of antiquity, and suitably applied to modern science. These labors had become the more necessary since intellectual cultivation and every trace of a political life in Greece had been swept away during the long and barbarous oppression of the Turks. What still existed in the modern Greek dialect of technical expressions in the different branches of science and art, had been supplied by uncouth Turkish or Italian words, which were still in the most ridiculous manner employed by the mass of the Greek people.† Nor did the reform of Korais extend so far: it remained only the sound foundation on which to build: and it was left to others to rear the edifice. It was the glory of the great Chiote to give form to the new language, but his works being mostly disquisitions on general literature or on political topics or new editions of the classics, they did not enrich the language with technical terms. This important task was now reserved for the professors of the Colleges and University at Athens. Thus, then, the copious vocabularies of modern discoveries and ideas were quickly—perhaps too

* Thus for instance, the modern Greeks call the steam-boat Ἀτμόκλοιον, from ἀτμός, steam and πλοῖον, a ship. They translate the mint τὸ νομισματοκοπεῖον, from νόμισμα, coin and κοπεῖον, the place where it is struck. They render the Quarantine τὸ λοιμοκαθαρτήριον, from λοιμός, the plague—and καθαρτήριον, the place where persons are cleansed. According to this system they often change the ancient signification of a word and call the artillery τὸ πυροβολικόν; the cannon τὸ πυροβόλον; and the gunner ὁ πυροβολιστής, because he throws fire from his engine.

† It was then extremely curious to hear the worthy old generals, Kolokotronis, Hadgipetros and other brave Pallikars recite their exploits in the mountains against the Turks in their Turko-Romaïc or Turko-Albanian lingo, which will be no longer understood by the youths of the rising generation, who now receive their education in the regular Colleges of a civilized country.

hurriedly—introduced into the Greek language on the return of peace. If, therefore, a foreigner should still nourish some doubts with regard to the existence of the Hellenic language, he might go to the Othonian University and there with admiration listen to the Greek professors, who hold forth in Philology, Theology, Mathematics, Medicine or Natural History in the pure and eloquent diction of the mother tongue of those sciences.

The Regency of the kingdom opened this new career with the decree relating to the organization of the geographical divisions of Greece. Provinces, towns, mountains, rivers, now received their classical names, which during the oppression of so many centuries had been lost among the barbarous Slavonic, Albanian and Turkish denominations. Thus Mistrás recovered the glorious name of Sparta, Slavochori, that of Amyclai, the sanctuary of Apollo; the miserable village Sinano in Arcadia adopted the sounding name of Megalopolis and the little filthy Miraca that of Olympia. Porto-Leone we now again called Peiraeus. The swamps of Mola gave way to the immortal Thermopylæ, and every Greek youngster is again proud to talk of his Leónidas!

Then followed in quick succession the civil and criminal codes, translated from the code Napoleon, but modified and adapted to the wants of Hellas, by the Regent Chevalier de Maurer. The numerous Royal ordinances on the organization of the municipal government, on the police and armed gendarmerie, on the quarantine, army and navy were all written in the pure New-Hellenic language by the Professors Constantinos Schinas, Philippos Joannou and Venthilas: yet they were but imperfectly understood by the mass of the illiterate people at that time, and the most curious mistakes were daily made. The Greek mountaineers would gather in the office of the governor, or in the custom-house and in their noisy manner dispute about the signification of a royal mandate. During that period I have often seen the Eparch or Nomarch, the governor of a province or district, standing on a platform in the market-

place, explaining the new laws to the lively multitude crowding around.

But the natural shrewdness of the Greeks, their docility and quick comprehension, and the many schools established all over the country in 1835, made them very soon understand the written language and express themselves with more correctness. The discourses of the National Assembly, eight years afterwards, gave the best proof of the remarkable progress of the language. Many excellent publications, in different branches of literature, contributed in an extraordinary manner to the completion of the language, while sixteen or twenty newspapers, reviews, and other periodicals, published at Athens, Syria, Nauplion and Patras, soon, in correctness and elegance of expression, passed far beyond the narrow limits, which the virtuous Adamanthios Korais had begun to give the language forty years ago.

It is a general opinion, prevalent in America, that the difference in the pronunciation of the Greek as it is spoken by the natives themselves and by strangers, who only learned that language through their study of the classical writers of antiquity, consists principally in the iotacism or the pronunciation of the vowel Eta and several diphtongs, as i or iota, thus producing a predominant i-sound, which seems unpleasant to the foreign ear.

But how great is the astonishment of the northern traveller, when, on his arrival in Greece, he discovers in the pronunciation of the native Greeks an extraordinary variety of sounds and modulations of the voice and an emphasis, a quickness, an accuracy of tone and accent, altogether strange to his ear, and which he needs must own to belong exclusively to the organs of a southern nation and particularly to the spirited Hellenic race and which no doubt is as ancient as their language.

Having for years studied the ancient Greek with the Danish or Erasmian pronunciation, and then read a number of modern Greek books, I boldly accosted the Athenians, on my arrival at the Peiraeus in 1834, in their Romaïc di-

alect, but to my utter surprise, the Greeks, with a smile and shrug of their shoulders, would answer me in Italian: "Signore, non parliamo il vostro Bavarese." "Sir, we do not speak your Bavarian language." Nor did I at the first moment separate the different sounds of their pronunciation, or understand a dialect, which I fancied that I already could master. Not only the vowels and dipthongs, but even the consonants, in their pronunciation, differ essentially from those of our own Anglo-Saxon or Scandinavian languages. Here lies the great difficulty in acquiring the true modern Greek pronunciation, and among the hundreds, and I may say thousands of foreigners, Americans, English, French and Germans, for years settled in Greece, only very few, and those only missionaries, professors, judges, physicians, or royal secretaries, were able, by constant study of the ancient language and by their speaking publicly the purified modern Hellenic tongue, to acquire a gramatically correct language and a full, clear and elegant pronunciation of the Greek, with its sharp accentuation and deep guttural and whistling sounds. Our broad and coarse pronunciation of the Greek can not be the criterion for judging of the euphony or beauty of a language, which is spoken with the more delicate organs of a southern nation, so different from our own.*

But it is not my intention here to stand forward as the defender of the Greek pronunciation against that adopted by the northern nations. I shall simply and historically attempt to show in what period and by what circumstances the Etacism or the Hollandish pronunciation of the Hellenic was introduced into the schools of western Europe, and then terminate this subject with a few specimens of modern Greek poetry.

* I would, in consequence, often excite the merriment of the Greeks by telling them that we northmen, when saying, for instance, "The Achæans and the Lacedemonians sailed to the Peiraeus, would would pronounce thus: Hoï Achaïoï kaï hoï Lakedaïmonioï eplûsan eis ton Peïraïéa—instead of: I Achæí kæ i Lakedhomónii éplefsan stom Biræá. They would regard this pronunciation as utterly impossible, and would never listen to any of our arguments intending to prove that we possessed the true Hellenic pronunciation of their language.

The ancient Greek classics were studied and the Hellenic language was spoken and written with more or less purity in the Byzantine Empire, during the middle ages; yet it remained nearly totally unknown at that time in western Europe.

The French and Venetian crusaders burnt Constantinople in 1204, and the ignorant Latin monks destroyed the precious Greek libraries, as belonging to the schismatics and containing their errors; and it is an historical fact that those extensive conquests in the east did not contribute to the introduction of the Greek language and literature into Italy, France or England. The few Universities of Italy at that period, those of Bologna, Padova and Naples, were wholly occupied with their disputations on scholastic philosophy and the study of the Roman Corpus Juris, after the discovery of the Pandects of Justinian, at Amalfi, near Naples, in 1137. A nearly total ignorance of the Greek classics prevailed, and the learned British monk, Roger Bacon, who lived at Oxford toward the middle of the thirteenth century, says that he could not find a single copy of a Greek Homer in England. Nor did the great Italian poet Petrarch, one century later, succeed in obtaining one Greek copy of that author in all Italy, though the celebrated Boccace at that time already began publicly to lecture at Florence on Greek literature.

It was not until the threatening conquests of the Othoman Turks in Europe and the impending danger of the Byzantine empire, that a more intimate communication was opened between Constantinople and Rome. Among the Greek ambassadors, sent to Italy in 1395 to demand assistance against the Turks, was Emanuel Chrysoloràs, who afterwards became the first native Greek professor lecturing on the Hellenic language at Florence. The still more celebrated Theodoros Gazis explained the Greek philosophers and orators at Milan and Constantinos Láscaris published his Greek Grammar in 1470, the first Greek book, which ever was printed.

After the overthrow of the Byzantine empire and the

conquest of Constantinople by Sultan Mohammed II., in 1453, a large number of learned Greeks fled to Italy and even to Germany, where Greek literature and philosophy soon began to excite universal enthusiasm and became the most important subjects of study. The native Greek professors and their Italian scholars, Poliziano, Poggio, Landino, Laurent-Valla many others, taught the Greek philology with the Greek pronunciation of Constantinople, which was precisely the same as that now used in the Levant. This pronunciation can historically be carried back through the middle ages as far as the second century of our era; while no evidence exists of any general change or modification having taken place in the pronunciation of that language, since the times of Alexander the Great, when the different Helenic dialects, the Attic, the Dorian and the Aeolic, began to be merged into the common Greek or *Κοινὴ γλῶσσα.*

Among the foreign students, who in the latter part of the fifteenth century frequented the Universities of Italy, were John Reuchlin, the German, and the celebrated Erasmus from Rotterdam in Holland. The former, who called himself in Greek Kápnios, (the Smoky from *Rauch*) became an eminent Hellenist, and lectured at Bâle in Switzerland with such success, that on hearing him explain the classics, the learned Greek Argyropulos exclaimed that the Muses of his deserted native land had fled to the north of the Alps.

Erasmus, from Rotterdam, on his return to Holland, felt some envy at the unrivalled success of Reuchlin in France and Germany, where the students flocked to hear him. It was Erasmus, who for the first time introduced our present pronunciation of the Hellenic, and the following ancedote has been assigned as the cause of this singular and untoward reform. A learned Spaniard, Henricus Glareanus, is said one day, while dining with Erasmus at the College of Louvain, in Belgium, to have told that irritable and credulous man, in mere jest, that some native

Greeks had lately arrived at Paris, who pronounced their language differently from the common mode in use. He said that these Greeks pronounced Vita like Beta, that they separated the diphthongs into their component vowels aï, eï, oï, and so on. Erasmus believing the jest of the jovial Spaniard, instantly resolved to be the first to promulgate this important news and going to work accordingly, composed a witty dialogue between a bear and a lion, in which the former, the bear, complains to the latter of the exceedingly difficult pronunciation of the Greek language, and the lion, in return, then humorously advises his thick-skulled companion, the bear, not to take the trouble of pronouncing the Greek with the Constantinoplitan sound of the diphthongs, but with that of the broad Dutch, which he pretends to have been the genuine pronunciation of Homer and Plato.

The burlesque form which Erasmus gave to his dissertation, and the fact that he himself did not employ this Dutch pronunciation or *etacism* in his own lectures, but on the contrary that of Constantinople, which he himself had learned in Italy, proves that he had no serious conviction of his own precepts, and that he did not intend to introduce any change—or at least that he was afraid of standing forward against his numerous and learned opponents and of being denounced by them as a literary heretic.

Nevertheless, both Reuchlin and others, took up the gauntlet in defence of the genuine Greek pronunciation and accent; while many Dutch professors, who found the etacism more convenient to the organs of their scholars, with great acrimony sustained the innovation of the Erasmian lion. This curious dispute was carried on with an immense apparatus of learning and with such success on the part of the Erasmian reformers or perverters, that they triumphantly introduced their system into all the schools of Holland, Germany and Scandinavia.

Nowhere did this literary war rouse the passions of the pedantic Savants, of that time, to such a pitch of intolerance and fury, as in England, particularly in Cambridge,

where two of the professors, Sir John Chek and Sir Thomas Smith, stood forth as champions for the innovation of Erasmus. On the contrary, the chancellor of the University, Stephen Gardener, Bishop of Winchester, remained a staunch defender of the Greeks, Chrysoloras and Gazis. Nay, this passionate prelate went even so far, as in a thundering decree of 1541, to prohibit the new doctrine, punishing the offender, if a professor, with the loss of his chair, if a student, with his exclusion from the academical dignities and honors, and if a pupil, with the whip and the ejection from school.*

In spite, however, of the opposition of the Bishop, the efforts of Chek and his colleague Smith, were eventually successful. The reform proceeded slowly, but steadily; and in England, and afterward in America, the modern Greek pronunciation, as introduced by Chrysoloras, Lascaris, Chalkokondylas, and the rest of their learned countrymen, was abandoned, and that suggested by Erasmus and his Dutch imitators, became the universal practice of Britain, as it had already become that of the other countries of Europe.

The truth arrived at by these argumentations about the pronunciation of the Hellenic language, in my opinion is simply this: that though some passages in Thucydides, Plato, and other ancient authors, together with the orthography of inscriptions and etymological inferences from Latin, are adduced in support of the modern pronunciation,—yet historically, it can not be proved farther back than the second century before Christ. In the palmy days of the Republics, the Attic dialect was particularly praised for its elegance, flexibility and softness, as Cicero says, which

---

* Chek had a long and virulent controversy with the chancellor, and series of their letters were published. In one of them the Bishop says: "I have read the treatise which you have transmitted to me, in which I find a copious stream of words, and a redundancy of speech: much reading, too, do I discern, and happiness of memory: besides industry and diligence in the pursuit of common and trivial matters. But know, Sir, that in a professor, I look also for *judgment* and *erudition*, and I condemn that arrogance, presumption and insolence, which so frequently flow from your pen." *Stephanus, Vitonens. Episcopus, Acad. Cantab. Cancellarius. Johan. Cheko, e. e. t.*

coincides far better with the modern Greek pronunciation than with that of Erasmus. The conversion of the diphthongs into the simpler sounds of æ and i is easy and natural. At the same time we may suppose that though the general character of the Greek pronunciation be the same, yet, the long reign of barbarism may have produced some change in regard to the sound of certain Greek letters, particularly the *i sounds*, and the loss of some of the nicer distinctions of the ancient, more civilized times, so that we may be allowed to dissent from the propriety of some of the sounds given to them by the modern Greeks, although generally we may be disposed to appeal to their authority. "It is easy to conceive," says Gibbon, "how every other depravation and barbarism should have, by degrees, crept upon the language,—but that the ancient sounds of its letters should be altogether lost and now unknown in Greece, itself alone of all countries, where that language is recited, is not to be believed." And this is the opinion of all enlightened Greeks themselves.

On my first arrival in Greece I was struck with the hoarse and rattling pronunciation of the common and illiterate people on the mainland of Greece, mostly mountaineers of Albanian descent, and their dialect appeared to me less harmonious than the Italian or Spanish. But I soon discovered, that all well educated Greeks, particularly the inhabitants of the Cycladian Islands, Smyrna and Constantinople, pronounce their different dialects with softness and harmony. No language in the world, perhaps, sounds sweeter, more soft and tender than the Romaic Greek on the lips of the brilliantly beautiful ladies of Smyrna, Ipsara and Constantinople.

It is this elegance of expression, the greater harmony of the vowels, the greater softness of the consonants, in accordance with a southern climate, scenery and manners—it is the authority of more than a thousand years—which at the present makes the pronunciation of the new Hellenic extend over all Europe. At five Universities in Germany, at Berlin, Kónigsberg, Breslau, Leipzig and Mu.

nich, professorships have been erected for the study of modern Greek literature; nay, a French College or Pension-house, has a few years ago been established by the French government in Athens, where, beneath the direction of the distinguished Othonian Professor, M. Charles Levesque, a number of young French philologians attend the lectures of the Othonian University, in order to impart a more thorough instruction of the Hellenic language and literature on their return to the Colleges of France.

The enthusiasm and skill with which the Greeks have accomplished the reform of their language have already borne their fruits: numerous and well attended schools and colleges, a progressing cultivation throughout the Levant, and a flourishing literature in every branch of study; yet my theme for the present must be limited to the popular dialect and the national songs of Greece.

I shall never forget the feeling of sympathy and delight, which the first Greek song I heard awakened in my heart. I had embarked on board a Greek brig at Malta. At sunset on the third day the wind had hushed; it was one of those beautiful calms on the broad bosom of the Mediterranean. We approached slowly the high beetling promontories of the Morea. All was life and gaity on board. The handsome young Hydriote, Demetrios Zacharis, took his guitar, and with a fine voice, began to sing the war-song of Constantinas Rhigas.

Σπάρτα, Σπάρτα, τὶ κοιμᾶσθε;
Ὕπνον λήθαργον βαρύν.
Ξύπνησον! κράξον Ἀθήνας
Σύμμαχον παντοτεινήν.—
Ἐνθυμεῖσθε Λεωνίδου
Ἥρως τοῦ ξακουστοῦ
Τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπαινουμένου
Φοβεροῦ καὶ τρομεροῦ!

Ὅπου εἰς τὰς Θερμοπύλας
Πόλεμον ἀυτὸς κρατεῖ

Καὶ τοὺς Πέρσας ἀφανίζει
Καὶ αὐτῶν καταπατεῖ.
Μὲ τριακοσίους ἄνδρας
Εἰς τὸ κέντρον προχωρεῖ
Καὶ ὡς λέων θυμωμένος
Εἰς τὸ αἷμα των βουτεῖ!

ὁ Χορός. *Τὰ ὅπλα ἂς λάβωμεν*
Παῖδες Ἑλλήνων ἀγωμεν
Ποταμηδὸν, ποταμηδὸν
Τῶν ἐχθρῶν τὸ αἷμα
Ἂς τρέξῃ ὑπὸ ποδῶν!

Sparta, Sparta, why in slumber?
Why in lethargy so deep?
Rouse thyself! thy friend awaken,
Glorious Athens, from her sleep.
Call to mind thy ancient warrior,
Great Leonidas of old,
Mighty man of fame immortal,
The tremendous and the bold.

See him!—where the noble patriot
All th' invading war withstands,
At Thermopylæ victorious
O'er the flying Persian bands
With his brave three hundred heroes,
Forward now the lion goes,
Plunging through the blood of battle,
To the centre of his foes.

Chorus—To arms then, our country cries,
Sons of the Greeks, arise, arise
Until the blood, in purple flood
From the hated foe,
Beneath our feet shall flow!

The tune of this song is plaintive, but the chorus is lively and stirring; it resembles the Marseillan Hymn, so well known from the French revolutionary wars. This song of the unhappy Rhigas excited as great an enthusiasm in Greece and caused the slaughter of thousands of Turks.

During the war with Turkey the mountain defiles of Thermopylæ, on the east, and of Messolunghi, on the west,

were the only two points by which an army could penetrate into the heart of Hellas; they were, therefore, both considered as the bulwarks of Greece, and the greatest efforts were made to defend them.

The ancient pass of Thermopylæ, so renowned in history, was situated near three copious springs of mineral water, bursting forth from the base of Mount Oeta and was closed by a wall, built by the ancient Phocians, of which ruins are seen to this day. The pass itself does no longer exist; the road to Thessaly is at this place open and undefended. The waters of the Maliac gulf have receded and laid bare the maritime swamps, at the mouth of the river Spercheios, where they now form extensive pasture-grounds.

Thus an entire army of 20,000 men in battle array can now march through the former pass of Leonidas. But eight miles farther south, the high and woody Mount Knemis cuts off all advance along the coast. Only a narrow pass between overhanging precipices opens westwards on the upper valley of Doris at the base of Mount Parnassos and the plain of Boeotia. This is the ancient pass of Elateia by which the crafty Philipp of Macedon, suddenly entered Hellas and so unexpectedly opposed and defeated the united Greeks at Chaeroneia.

The French Crusaders built here the strong and picturesque Castle of Boudonitza, commanding the pass below, toward the Thermopylæ, at that period called the Iron-gates or *les Portes de fer*.

Here was, during the last war, the glorious battle-field of Ulysses or Odysseus, the brave son of Andriskos. From the height of the pass we overlook a most splendid prospect toward the distant island of Euboea and Mount Pelion in Thessaly on the east—and the whole plain of Doris and Boeotia on the west, bounded by the two immense snow-capped peaks of Mount Parnassos.

A beautiful plaintive song, sung by every Greek, commemorates the brave defence of the Greeks, guarding the defiles with some few devoted warriors against the thousands of wild Turkish horsemen and Jenizaries encamped

on the coast below. A young Greek, called Pelopidas, is placed on guard on the ridge over against the Turkish camp, and during the starry night, his heart swelling with the affections of home, he thus sends forth his greeting to his native land.

Λαμπρὸς ποτε φωσφόρος τῶν νυκτῶν,
Ἐφώτιζε σκηνὰς τὰς Ἑλληνίδας,
Ἐκεῖ πλησίον τὴν λόγχευ του κρατῶν,
Ἐτραγῳδοῦσεν ὁ νέος Πελοπίδας.
Ὦ Ζέφυροι τερπνοί! πετᾶτ' εὐδύς,
Μηνύσατ' εἰς τὴν φίλην μου Ἑλλάδα,
Διὰ τὴν δόξαν σου, πατρίς,
Φρουρῶ ἐδῶ εἰς τὴν κοιλάδα.

Τηρεῖ τὴν λάμψιν τοῦ ἐχθρικοῦ πυρὸς,
Καὶ σιωπᾷ σ' τὸν τόπον του θεμένος,
Ἡ νύκτα χρόνος ὁ Ἕλλην ζωηρὸς,
Καὶ τραγῳδεῖ 'ς τὴν λόγχην στηριγμένος.—
Ὦ Ζέφυροι τερπνοὶ κ. τ. λ.

Ὁ Ἥλιος τὸν πόλεμον κινᾷ,
Ἄυριον εἶν' ἡμέρα τῆς ἀνδρίας,
Ἂν ἀποθάνω 'ς τὴν λόγχην μου σιμὰ,
Ὑπὲρ πατρίδος, καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας,
Πετᾶτε πάλιν, ὦ ζέφυροι τερπνοὶ,
Μυνήσατε 'ς τὴν φίλην μου Ἑλλάδα,
Διὰ τὴν δόξαν σου, πατρίς,
Ἀπέθανεν, εἰς τὴν κοιλάδα!

"The bright star of morning once more dawned on the tents of the Greeks, when young Pelopidas in arms and on guard, thus sent his love to his dear home.

Mild zephyrs, fly swiftly and announce to my dear Hellas, that for the sake of her glory, I watch here in the valley."

The spirited young Greek, throughout the night, affronts the enemy's fire: he remains silent on his post and leaning on his lance, remembers his sweet home.

"The sun stirs the war—to-morrow is the day of the brave, and if I die here in arms for my country and freedom, then

Fly, oh ye breezes, and announce to my dear Hellas how her youth did perish on the battle-field here in the valley."

Of equal importance for the safety of Greece was the defence of Missolunghi on the coast of Acarnania, protecting the passes of Mount Chalkis, which opens a communication with the gulf of Lepanto and Patras in the Morea.

The danger of the small fortress Messolunghi was imminent, when, during the summer of 1823, Mustapha Pasha of Scodra, in Upper Albania, led an immense army of wild Mohammedan Albanians through the defiles of Mount Pindus toward the open plains of Acarnania.

The greatest disorder reigned at Messolunghi, which was not yet sufficiently fortified and provisioned to withstand a regular seige; because Lord Byron, though daily expected, had not yet arrived.

But the brave Marcos Botzaris, with his four hundred Souliotes, resolved to surprise the Turkish camp, while yet in the mountains. With their long Albanian rifle slung over their shoulders, the light footed Souliotes, with almost incredible celerity, traversed the lakes and swamps and ascending the rugged mountains, occupied the forests immediately above the Turkish camp, the green and purple tents of which extended throughout the whole valley toward the city of Karpenisi.

At mid-night, Markos, with his Souliotes, supported at a distance by other Greek bands, covering their flanks, crossed the out-posts of the Turks by saluting them in the Albanian tongue, with the usual "bésa dià bésa," (peace be with you) and arriving in the centre of the hostile camp, he gave the signal for battle, and rushed into the brilliantly illuminated tent of Mustaphá Pashá. All the sleeping officers and attendants were butchered, and the Souliotes finding a Turk of distinction sleeping in an inner apartment, they supposed him to be the Pasha himself. Grasping him by the beard, they dragged him out of the

tent. But the Pasha had escaped, the prisoner being his secretary; he was immediately cut to pieces. The scene of slaughter and confusion was terrific. In the darkness of night, Turks, Albanians, Souliotes, all sabre in hand, were fighting most desperately against one another, while the shouts of the Greek bands in the distance, announced that the camp was surrounded by numerous foes. Yet the thundering voice of Botzaris, dealing death blows around him, was heard above the din of the battle, and when some Turkish *agados* or commanders hurried between the combatants, calling out that all was a mistake, Botzaris cut them down and shouted: "No mistake, ye infidels, Botzaris is here!"

At these words shots were fired at him from all sides, and the hero fell in the arms of victory. For the Greeks, having joined the Souliotes, the Turks gave way, and abandoning their camp, fled in disorder toward Karpinisi, leaving an immense booty of horses, arms and provisions in the hands of the Greeks. Messolunghi was saved—but indescribable was the sorrow of the Souliotes at the loss of their leader. Botzaris fell on the 20th of August, 1823, in the 30th year of his age. His remains were carried to Messolunghi and buried in the battery which still bears his name, with all the honors he so well deserved, and all the pomp that the melancholy circumstances of the town could afford.

It was during the excitement and sorrow which this event produced in the mind of all the Greeks, that the simple but beautiful dirge of Markos Botzaris was sung, while the Souliotes shedding tears of sincere affection and veneration, surrounded the bier on which lay the bravest son of Souli.

Ἕλληνες κλαύσωμεν ἄνδρα γενναῖον,
Τὸν Μάρκον Βότσαρην Ἥρωα νέον·
Οὗτος ἀπέθανεν ἡρωϊκῶς,
Τοῦτον τὸν Ἥρωα ἂς μιμηθῶμεν,
Ἂν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν μας ὄντως ποθῶμεν,
Καὶ θέλει θραύσωμεν ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν.

"Ανδρες ὁμόνοια 'ς ἡμᾶς ἀνήκει,
Καὶ ὁ ὑπέρτατος μᾶς τάζει νίκη,
Νίκην βεβαίαν τε καὶ ἀσφαλῆ.

Τοῦρκοι σκληρότατοι! ἂν ἐφονεύθη
'Ο Μάρκο Βότσαρης δὲν 'λιγοστεύθη
'Η ἐναντίον σας 'Ελλήνων ὁρμή.
"Ηρωα Βότσαρη, 'Ηπείρου θῦμα!
'Σ ὅλους τοὺς "Ελληνας ἄφησες τραῦμα,
Σῶμά σου' χάσαμεν, οὐκ ἀρετάς.
"Υπαγε ἀθάνατε 'ς τὰς οὐρανίους
Σκηνὰς τοῦ πλάστου μας μὲ ὕμνους θείους,
Καὶ δέου πάντοτε διὰ ἡμᾶς.

Greeks! Let us weep for the Hero Botzaris,
For the Patriot, who died so nobly for us.
Whilst freedom burns in our hearts, let us imitate our Marco and exterminate our enemies.
Sons of Greece, in concord is our strength, united, the Almighty will give victory to our banners.
Turks, cruel and bloody, Botzaris is no more,
But the fire of our hate burns fiercer than before.
Noble Botzaris, pride of Epirus, thy death wound pierced each breast! We have lost thy strong arm, but thy virtues remain with us.
Ascend to God Almighty, great spirit! and before the Eternal throne let thy prayers in divine hymns eternally rise for thy country.

These airs, and many others as characteristic, are daily sung by the Greeks, but their battle-song, or *ἐμβατήριον*, which is at present the national song of the army, the Yankee-doodle of the Hellenes, is the following extremely lively song, which never loses its exciting effect when the whole front of the battle-line, lowering the bayonets, is rushing to the attack.

'Η ἀθλία 'Ελλὰς 'ς τὸν βαρὺν ζυγὸν στενάζει,
Τοὺς πιστούς της υἱοὺς εἰς βοήθειάν της κράζει,
'Αλύσους νὰ συντρίψουν,
Δεσμά της ν' ἀποῤῥίψουν,

Καὶ τρόπαια λαμπρὰ νὰ στήσουν κατ' ἐχθρῶν,
Ἐυοῖ! ἐυοῖ! ἐυοῖ! ἐυοῖ!
Θράμετε, Ἕλληνες! μεγάλοι καὶ μικροί.

Ὁ Καιρὸς, ἀδελφοὶ, τῆς ἐλευθερίας φθάνει,
Καὶ τὸ γένος ἡμῶν τὰς δυνάμεις του λαμβάνει.
Γενναῖοι, Ρουμελιῶται,
Μωραΐται καὶ νησιῶται,
Τὸ αἷμα τῶν τυράννων χύστε ποταμηδόν.
Σπαθί! σπαθί! σπαθί! σπαθί!
Δράξατε, Ἕλληνες, μεγάλοι καὶ μικροί.

* * *

Μὴ φοβῆσθε, Γραικοί, ὅτι εἶσθε τάχ' ὀλίγοι,—
Ἡ Εὐρώπη ἰδού, τὰς ἀγκάλας της ἀνοίγει.
Ὁ Τύραννος κλονεῖται,
Τὴν πτῶσίν του φοβεῖται.
Ὁ ζῆλος τῆς πατρίδος ἂς λάμψ' εἰς τὰς ψυγάς.
Φωτιά! φωτιά! φωτιά! φωτιά!
Τρέξατε Ἕλληνες, γυναῖκες καὶ παιδιά!

* * *

Μὴ φοβῆσθε Γραικοί, τοὺς Λαοὺς τοὺς τρισβαρβάρους.
Εἶναι ὄχλος πολὺς δίχως τόλμης τε καὶ θάρρους.
Ὡς πότε τυραννία;
Ζήτω ἡ Ἐλευθερία!
Τὸ αἷμα τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἂς τρέξῃ πρὸ ποδῶν.
Φωτιά! φωτιά! φωτιά! φωτιάν
Βάλλετ' Ἕλληνες, εἰς ὅλην τὴν Τουρκιάν!

Wretched Hellas sighs in the heavy yoke and calls forth her sons to break her chains, to fling off her bonds and raise glorious trophies won from the foe.

To Arms, ye Greeks, let the sword be swung by old and young.

Now, oh Brethren, is the hour of liberty, the whole nation feels its power and thrills with rapture! Oh ye brave, from the Highlands, the plains and the islands, rush on, give no quarter, let flow in one stream the blood of the Turk, arm, arm, draw the sword, all ye great and ye small.

Do not fear, oh ye Greeks, that you are few—look how all Europe opens her arms, while the tyrant trembles and dreads his fall. Let the love of old Hellas inflame the hearts of all.

Do not fear, oh ye Greeks, those barbarous hordes, their masses are without valor and firmness. How long then this tyranny—huzza for liberty.

Fire, fire, let the flames envelop all Turkey.

The victories of the Greeks on the mainland and their naval triumphs in the Archipelago during the first years of the war of independence—1821—1824—excited the highest enthusiasm among the inhabitants of the seven Ionian Islands, then, as now, occupied by English garrisons and recognizing the protection of Great Britain. The policy of the court of Saint James was then as hostile to the cause of Greek emancipation as it shows itself at the present moment adverse to the reunion of the Ionians with their brethren under the liberal government of King Otho. The Lord High Commissioner, Sir Thomas Maitland, therefore considered the noble efforts of a heroic nation as a foolish presumption and criminal revolt, and ruled over the islands with the iron rod of true British despotism. Yet in spite of the severest prohibition, hundreds of warlike Ionians, commanded by Andreas Metaxas, Gerasimos Phokas and other valiant chiefs, embarked from Zante and Corfù and wielded their swords bravely at Lala and in other battles in the Morea.* At that time of generous sympathy Count Dionysus Solomos, a distinguished poet in Zante published his beautiful hymn to liberty, one of the lyrical master-pieces of our age.†

Adressing the Genius of Liberty, the Poet thus begins his poem in the popular dialect of Zante:

---

*See the History of the Greek Revolution by Spyridon Trikupis. London, 1853, Vol. I., page 328, et sq. A noble work in modern Greek.

† Ὕμνος εἰς τὴν Ἐλευτερίαν ἐγραφὲ Διονύσιος Σολωμὸς Ζακύνθιος, τὸν Μάϊον Μῆνα 1823. Ἐν Μεσολογγίῳ 1825, with an Italian translation by Prof. G. Grassetti. I have not personally known Count Solomos, who lived retired and melancholy in Corfù, but visiting his sister in Zante in 1840, she presented me with a copy of this delightful poem, perhaps the only one now in the United States. That lovely young lady married in 1842 Count Nicolo Conrado Lunzi, a benevolent and liberal nobleman of Zante, at whose country seat, Kallipado, I spent some of the happiest days of my life.

1. *Σὲ γνωρίζω ἀπὸ τὴν κόψι*
Τοῦ σπαθιοῦ τὴν τρομερὴ,
Σὲ γνωρίζω ἀπὸ τὴν ὄψι,
Ποῦ μὲ βία μετράει τὴν γῆ.

2. *Ἀπ' τὰ κόκκαλα βγαλμένη*
Τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὰ ἱερὰ,
Καὶ σὰν πρῶτα ἀνδρειωμένη,
Χαῖρε, ὦ χαῖρε, Ἐλευθριά!

3. *Ἐκεῖ μέσα ἐκατοικοῦσες,*
Πικραμένη, ἐντροπαλὴ,
Κ' ἕνα στόμα ἀκαρτεροῦσες,
Ἔλα πάλι, νὰ σοῦ' πῇ.

4. *Ἄργιε νάλθῃ ἐκείνη ἡ' μέρα,*
Καὶ ἦταν ὅλα σιωπηλὰ,
Γιατὶ τἄσκιαζε ἡ φοβέρα,
Καὶ τὰ πλάκονε ἡ σκλαβιά.

5. *Δυστυχής! παρηγορία*
Μόνη σοῦ ἔμενε νὰ λὲς
Περασμένα μεγαλεῖα,
Καὶ δεηγοῦντάς τα νὰ κλαῖς.

6. *Καὶ ἀκαρτέρει, καὶ ἀκαρτέρει*
Φιλελεύθερην λαλιὰ
Ἕνα ἐκτύπαε τἄλλο χέρι
Ἀπὸ τὴν ἀπελπησιὰ,

7. *Κ' ἔλεες· πότε ἄ! πότε βγάνω*
Τὸ κεφάλι ἀπὸ τς' ἐρμιαῖς;—
Καὶ ἀποκρίνοντο ἀπὸ πάνω
Κλάψαις, ἄλυσσες, φωναῖς.—

I know thee by the terrible edge of thy sword,
I know thee by thy look, which rapidly measures the earth.

Risen from the sacred bones of the Greeks and brave as of yore, I hail thee, oh Liberty.

Yonder thou didst dwell, mournful and hopeless, awaiting the voice: "Now, rise again!"

But that day did tarry—all was silence—
Menace frightened thee and thraldom oppressed thee.

Miserable Hellas! no other comfort hadst thou, but to recall the memory of thy former greatness—and to weep!

And thou didst wait for that thrilling voice, and didst fold thy arms in silent despair.

"When shall I raise my head from the gloom of the desert," saidst thou—and thy children answered with tears, with wailing and the rattling of chains!

The Poet then most poetically describes fair Hellas in her blood-stained garments, wandering far away to sue for assistance "but alas! when misery knocks, the doors seldom will open."

Δὲν εἶν' εὔκολαις ἡ Θύραις
Ἐὰν ἡ χρεία ταῖς κουραλῇ.—

Refused with scorn, poor Greece calls her despairing children to arms, and the wild shout of liberty now reechoes over sea and land.

The United States of Washington, says the Poet, joyfully hail that voice and remember the chains which once kept them in bondage.

But the British Leopard looks grimly and its angry roar is heard to the utmost deserts of Russia—while the eagle of Austria, from her cloudy heights, whets her beak, still reaking with the heart's-blood of prostrate Italy.

Having in burning verses given an awful and truly poetical picture of the storming of Tripolizza and the bloody revenge taken on Dramm-Aly Pasha, the Tiger, in the defiles of Korinth, the poet, in powerful verses warns his countrymen against the still more dangerous enemy who remains behind on the battle field of the slaughtered Moslems—Fatal Discord—and admonishes his fellow-citizens,

with Christian love and forbearance to complete the great work. "By all the precious blood—says he—you so freely have shed for your country and religion, I conjure you, O Hellenes, embrace one another like brothers—united in love, victory will follow you for ever!"

Πάντα ἡ νίκη, ἂν ἑνωθῆτε—
Πάντα ἐκεῖ, ὅ ' δειλιάσει.

The popular poetry of the modern Greeks is rich in love songs—*δσματα ἐρωτικά*—which is sung to the guitar and are as tender or passionate as they are modest and sparkling with poetical pictures taken from nature. I have already in an earlier number of the Review related the melancholy event in the Island of Zante which caused the following farewell of an unhappy lover to be sung all over Greece.*

THE LAST FAREWELL.

It dawns; the Morn-star glows on high,
And tells us that the Sun is nigh;
Soon will he rise o'er yon blue main,—
But never on our loves again!

Fast fades the moon, all pale her ray,
Pale as thy cheek on that glad day,
When first—while tears with utterance strove,—
I heard thee falter forth—"I love."

O how all nations smiled around,
When first I felt that heart's rebound,
When that fond heart throbb'd back to mine
And my full soul was lost in thine.

But now of the sweet flowers bereft,
To us the thorns alone are left,
Love's lasting pangs, its tears, its sighs,
Its fears and death-fraught agonies.

* Mercersburg Quarterly Review, Vol. V., 1853, page 393. I reprint the Greek text, because that of 1853 can hardly be understood on account of the many errata that have been left in the text, by the loss of the proof sheet, during my absence from Lancaster. The translation has been made by the late British Consul in Philadelphia, Hon. William Peter, A. M., of Christ's church, Oxford, who was as distinguished as a classical scholar and poet as he was honored and loved as a true hearted friend and noble minded citizen

Γλυκοφέγγει, καὶ τὸ ἄστρο τῆς ἀυγούλας
Σημαδέυει πῶς ὁ ἥλιος προβαίνει
Ἴσως πλέον γιὰ τ' ἐμᾶς δὲν θαὐγαίνει,
Νὰ μᾶς ' βρίσκῃ ἐνωμένα τὰ δυό.

Πάει ἀχνίζοντας τ' ὡραῖον φεγγάρι.
Ὁποῦ μ' ἔδειχνε τ' ἀχνὸ πρόσωπον σου
Μιὰ βραδειὰ ἕνα δάχρυ ' δικόν σου
Ὅταν μ' ἔλεγες, ἐγὼ σ' ἀγαπῶ.—

Τότ' ἡ φύσις μ' ἐμᾶς ἐχαιρῶταν
Γλυκὰ μ' ἔσφιγγες στὴν ἀγκαλιάν σου
Ἡ καρδιά μ' ἐκτυποῦσ' στὴν καρδιάν σου
Κ' ἡ ψυχή μου ἦν ὅλη μὲ σέ.

Ἀλλὰ τώρα τὰ ἄνθη' χαθῆκαν,
Καὶ μᾶς ἔμειναν μόνα τ' ἀγκάθια
Σκληροῦ Ἔρωτος αἰώνια πάθια
Πικρὰ βάσανα καὶ στεναγμοί!—

Another popular song which often is heard in Greece, sung to a sweet melody, is that of the homeless, roaming little bird that is enticed into a cage by a maiden. I give here the Greek text on account of the simplicity and beauty of the dialect with a correct and elegant translation in the metre of the original by Prof. William M. Nevin.

Τὸ πλανήμενον πουλί.

1. *Πουλάκι ξένο, ξενιτευμένο,*
Κυνηγημένο, ποῦ νὰ σταθῶ;
Ποῦ νὰ καθήσω, νὰ ξενυχτίσω,
Νὰ μὴ χαθῶ;—

2. *Βραδιάζ' ἡ 'μέρα, σκοτάδι παίρνει,*
Καὶ δίχως ' ταίρι, πῶς ναὐρεθῶ;
Πῶς νὰ φωλιάσω σὲ ξένο δάσο
Ν' ἀποσυρθῶ;—

8. 'Η 'μέρα φεύγει, ἡ νύχτα βιάζει,
Νά! ἡσυχάζει κάθε πουλί.
Κ' ἐγὼ στενάζω, τὸ 'ταίρι χράζω—
Ξένο πουλί!

4. Κυττάζω τ' ἄλλα πουλιὰ ζευγάρια.
Αὐτὴν τὴν χάρι δὲν ἔχω πλειά.
Ἔρημον τρέχω, τόπον δὲν ἔχω,
Μηδὲ φωλιά!

5. Ναὶρῶ γυρίζω, πῶς νὰ κάθήσω,
Νὰ ξεκουτήσω κἂν μοναχό;
Κάθε κλαδάκι βαστᾶ πουλάκι
Ζευγαρωτό.

6. Δὲν μὲ γνωρίζουν, κ' ἐδῶ μὲ διώχνουν,
Κ' ἐκεῖ μ' ἀπώχνουν, ποῦ νὰ σταθῶ,
Ἄχ! πῶς νὰ γένω; ποῦ νὰ πηγαίνω,
Νὰ μὴν χαθῶ;

7. Δεγοῦν οἱ κλάδοι, τὰ φύλλα σειοῦνται,
Γλυκοτζεμπιοῦνται τ' ἄλλα πουλιά.
Κ' ἐγὼ τὸ ξένο, τὸ πικραμένο,
Χωρὶς φωλιά!

8. 'Απορρεμένο σὲ ἄγρι' ἀγκάθια,
Πικρά μου πάθια καὶ ξενυτιαῖς,
Θρηνῶντας μένω, κ' ἐκεῖ διαβαίνω
Κακαῖς νυκτιαῖς.

9. Κ' ἐκεῖ' ποῦ στέκω μαμουργιασμένο,
Καὶ μαραμένο θρηνολογῶ.
Μιὰ, νέα 'βγαίνει, ἁρματωμένη,
'Σὰν κυνηγός.

10. Βαστάει δίκτυα, δίκτυ' ἁσημένια,
Συρματερένια στ' ἀριστερό.
Καὶ 'ς τὴ δεξιά της, μὲ τ' ἅρματά της,
Κλουβ' ἀργυρό.

11. Φορέματ' ἄσπρα, κι' ἄσπρη μὲ χάρι,
Ὅλη φεγγάρι βαθειᾶς νυκτός.
Λὲς κ' εἶν' ἐκείνη, ὁποῦ τοῦ δίνει
Λάμψιν καὶ φῶς —

12. Περνᾷ κοντά μου, καὶ μὲ κυττάζει,
Γλυκὰ μὲ κράζει καὶ μὲ λαλεῖ.
Ἔλα, πουλάκι! μεσ' 'ς τὸ κλουβάκι
Ξένο πουλί!

13. Ἔμβα, μου λέγει, ἔμβα τὸ ξένο,
Τὸ πικραμένο, ν' ἀναπαυθῇς.
Γιὰ νὰ καθήσῃς, νὰ ξενυκτήσῃς,
Νὰ μὴ χαθῇς.

14. Πουλί, δακόν μου νὰ σ' ἀποκτήσω,
Καὶ νὰ σὲ στήσω χρυσῆν φωλιά.
'Σ αὐτὴν νὰ ζήσῃς, νὰ λησμονήσῃς
Τὴν ξενιτειά.—

15. Μὴ σε πειράζει κλεισμένον νἆσαι,
Καὶ μὴ φοβᾶσαι νὰ σκλαβωθῇς.
Ἔλα 'ς ἐμέρα, τ' εἶσαι σὲ ξένα,
Καὶ μὴ χαθῇς.

16. Σὲ τάζω μ' ὅρκον τὴν 'λευθεριάν σου,
Χωρὶς καμμιὰν σου ἀμφιβολιά,
Ὅταν θηλήσῃς, κλουβὶ ν' ἀφήσῃς,
Καὶ τὴν φωλιά.

17. 'Σ ταῖς τόσαις χάρες, 'ς τὰ σπλαγχνικά της
Λόγια γλυκά της, πλειὸ δὲν ἀρχῶ.
Φτερά μ' ἁπλόνω 'ς αὐτὴν ζυγόνω
Πολὺ γοργό.

18. Καὶ 'ς τὸ χρυσό της, πετῶ χαρά,
Καὶ 'ς τὸ κλουβάκι προτοῦ νἆμβω,
Τὰ ζαχαρένια, τὰ κουραλλένια
Χείλια τσιμπῶ.

THE HOMELESS BIRD.

1. Where, a lone stranger, fleeing from danger,
Far away ranger, hunted, forlorn,—
Where shall I seat me; through the night keep me,
Not to be torn?

2. Soft day is waning, night on it gaining;
No mate remaining, where may I come?
In this unknown grove how longer lone rove?
Where find a home?

3. Twilight is failing, dark night prevailing;
And sleep assailing comes the birds o'er;
While I, still here late, cry for my dear mate—
Coming no more!

4. Other birds mated I see elated;
From me, illfated, no longer blest,
Wand'ring, forsaken, was that joy, taken—
No home, no nest.

5. Oh, I might hover all the trees over,
I could discover naught to perch on;
Its bird well faring each bough is bearing—
Mated each one.

6. These do not know me; off they all throw me,
Sharp pecks bestow me, turn where I may.
From deaths that threat me, ah! to protect me,
Where may I stay?

7. From leaves renewing till their undoing,
Billing and cooing, birds are all blest.
For me, the stranger, sorrowful ranger,
Is there no nest.

8. Thrown now asunder, all the day under
Dense thorns I wander, in my sad plight,
And 'neath them keeping, still lonely weeping,
Watch all the night.

9. These my breast paining, my feathers staining.
Must I remaining still sadly press?
See! that fair maiden, bright garb arrayed in,
As a huntress,

10. O'er the lawn faring, her left hand bearing
Nets for ensnaring and wires to seize,
While what engages her right, a cage is;—
Silvered all these!

11. White clad and gleaming, with beauty beaming,
As the moon seeming in the deep night,
One might suppose that she 'twas who throws that
Pale orb her light.

12. Near draws she to me.—What will she do me?—
Now stops to view me. Hear what she sings:
Poor little mourner, weary sojourner,
With drooping wings,

13. From woes that press thee, from fears that chase thee,
Hither come haste thee, to my cage flee;
Within its keeping, all the night sleeping,
Safe shalt thou be.

14. No more a roamer, gentle new comer,
Come with me summer, come be thou mine;
A cage shall serve thee—from ills preserve thee,—
Of golden shine.

15. No fear, sweet stranger, that 'twill bring danger
Freedom to change for service to me;
No birds to scare thee, no thorns to tear thee,
Blest shalt thou be.

16. Or if 'twill grieve thee ever, believe me,—
I'll not deceive thee, on earth I swear,—
Free will I set thee from thy cage, let thee
Take the wide air.

18. Me thus befriending, favor extending,
On her depending would I rely;
No danger dreading, my fond wings spreading,
To her I fly.

18. By her small golden hand am I holden,
And ere, I thralled, into her cage slip,
Her ripe mouth willing, sweet, am I billing—
Her coral lip!

Another kind of national ballads, sung to the lyre and accompanying the warriors' dance—the Romaïka—are those describing in lively pictures the heroic deeds or daring adventures of the Klephts or mountain-robbers, who never yielded to the Turk and at the outbreak of the Greek insurrection in 1821, were the first who, armed and prepared, victoriously encountered their deadly enemy.

These artless, but often highly poetical songs are composed in the roughest dialect and difficult to be understood on account of their frequent allusions to the manners and peculiar habits or superstitions of the Highlanders and the mountain scenery of northern Greece and Epirus. I shall nevertheless here insert one of these τραγῳδια κλέπτικα, the subject of which is similar to that of Schiller's celebrated tragedy of "the Robbers," in which the Captain of the brigands, on account of his love to a beautiful maiden, is deserted by his savage band and perishes by their hands. The translation in the metre of the original Romaïc is by Prof. Felton of Harvard College.

THE ROBBER CAPTAIN IN LOVE.

Conduct thee wisely, Nicholas, as well becomes a Captain,
Nor with thy children be at strife, nor venture to insult them;
For they an evil plot have laid, resolving they will slay thee.
"Who is it with my children talk? who is it tells them stories?
Well! when the blooming spring shall come, and when shall come the summer,
To Xerolibadá I go, and to our ancient quarters,
Thither I go to wed my love to take the fair-haired maiden:
With golden coins I'll deck my love, with strings of pearl adorn her."
The Pallikars they heard his words and scornful was their anger,
Three shots they gave him all at once, and all the three were fatal.
"Down with the weakling fool!"—they cried—"shoot down the worthless wanton.
From us he took the golden coins to win the fair-haired maiden,
Our fair-haired maid the pistol is, the sabre is our mistress."

All these songs of the Klephts from Agrapha and Valtos, all the ballads from the war of independence, which are the emanation of the popular feelings of that day, though often expressed in the roughest of dialects, contain a treasure like the massive gold-ore of the mountain, and are the truest and most eloquent documents of the modern history of Greece. They must, therefore, all be carefully collected and rescued before the stream of time shall carry them away, as they otherwise must necessarily perish with the generation that sang, fought and conquered.

The Greek, with the guitar on his knee, will give words to his feelings like the Italian and Spaniard. His voice is

less harmonious than theirs; his music harsh and monotonous, his language less soft and polished—but he nevertheless paints with the true and vivid colors of nature, in animated pictures, the events of a southern life, of domestic sorrows and affections, and sketches, often with a single touch, the splendid scenery of Greece. These national melodies all express a deep romantic sentiment, blended with good humor, wit and tenderness. We find here no elaborateness, no art, no polish or affectation. It is nature herself that springs warm from the heart and speaks as eloquently as in the fragrant blossoms of spring and in the artless warbling of the birds. They are the poetical effusions of an imaginative and lively people, which even during its bondage under Turkish oppression and its total exclusion from political activity and ambition, knew how to preserve its yearning and hope for the attainment of future freedom and happiness.

Another view of this subject would carry us into the consideration of the more artistic productions of the learned poets of modern Greece, of the poetry of Rhisos Rhangavis, Alexander and Panaghiotis Soutsos, Karatchutchas and others, who have attained considerable celebrity by their elegant compositions in the pure and refined New-Hellenic language. Every branch of literature, theology, history, the mathematics and natural sciences possess valuable works by modern Greek writers, which often are translated into the languages of Western Europe. Only in the Drama they seem still to be behind-hand, though the tragedies of Alfieri and Monti in modern Greek translations have been brought on the stage at Athens with success, and lively satiric commedies, such as that of the *Poor Fortune Hunter*, have lashed the Bavarian adventurers and the misrule of the foreign administration, with Aristophanic wit and acrimony, to the delight of the applauding audience.

In a later article I may come back to this highly interesting subject; my next contribution will be my researches on the history of Athens during the less known, but not

less important, period of the Middle Ages and the formation of of a Frankish State under the Dukes of Athens.

A. K. L.

Franklin and Marshall College, Dec. 1, 1859.

ART. II.—CHURCHLINESS.

Although the word *Churchliness* has not yet found its way into our Dictionaries, yet its general use by standard theological writers may be regarded as having obtained for it a place in the English language. It signifies that spirit or animus which makes due account of the Holy Catholic Church as confessed in the Apostles' Creed. The idea of the Church is, undoubtedly, just as essential to the existence and perpetuity of Christianity in the world, as is that of the state for the maintenance of law and order in society. Neither the one nor the other is the result of any human calculation or economical arrangement. Civil law cannot actualize itself except in and through an organization called the state, and the life and principles of the Christian religion equally demand an organization called the Church, if they are not to remain mere abstractions. The idea of the state grows out of the revelation of the divine will in the social nature of man, by which he is constituted a member of a family or race, and not merely an independent individual among many others. The idea of the Church occupies a similar relation to man as he stands in the Kingdom of grace.

But granting the necessity of the Church to the existence of Christianity, there is still room for great difference of opinion as regards its particular form. This is not fixed in the word of God. The Saviour evidently did not dictate a system of Church polity except in its essential features, such as the establishment of the holy ministry and

the appointment of the sacraments. Further particulars were left to arrange themselves in the course of Christian history, for the reason that Christianity is life and not an outward, mechanical system. Its outward form may vary in its non-essential features, as was the case with Judaism. The form of primitive Christianity differed from the mediæval polity of the Church, and this latter again was outgrown at the period of the Reformation. Since that period the Protestant Church, with all its life and activity, has failed to assume a definite outward form. Its present distracted condition has proved itself to be unsatisfactory, and hence internal movements may everywhere be discerned towards meeting this great want. The Church Question has become the great problem of the age. We do not believe that this problem is to be solved by any particular method which human foresight can specify. We look for its solution rather in the way of a historical necessity. Nothing is so important, in contributing to this much desired solution, as to be in possession of a churchly spirit, and hence the great importance of understanding what is churchly and what is its opposite.

It may be premised, that a true churchly spirit is primarily something internal and not external. It does not concern itself first about the particular outward form which the Church must assume. To be specially and primarily interested in the form of Church government, the style of Church architecture, the particulars of worship, or the appropriate habit of the clergy, is to tithe mint, anise and cummin, and neglect the weightier matters of the law. It is, therefore, a fact worthy of notice that the Mercersburg movement started not in this outward way, but concerned itself rather with certain ideas which lie at the heart and core of the whole matter. And it is not to be inferred now, that those who presume to stand in the forefront in taking due care of the outward incidents connected with this subject, are therefore necessarily the most churchly. Unless these ideas take deep root, and continue to exercise their full power, the settling of the outward form

must prove in the end to be a mere useless, empty sham. In directing attention to some of these ideas which lie at the basis of the Mercersburg movement, which has, not without reason, attracted the notice of the Christian world, we presume not to set forth anything new, but merely to attempt to show their relation to a true churchly spirit.

I. The first that we mention is, *A correct view of the person of Christ.*

That a correct view of the person of Christ stands related to a true churchly spirit, not arbitrarily, but in a necessary and inherent way, may be inferred from the manner in which the two are brought together by the Lord Jesus Christ himself. In that remarkable and much disputed passage in Matt. 16: 13–20, this connection is clearly designated. The time had come for the disciples to make their confession of faith in Christ. To the Jews the Saviour appeared as yet only a great prophet. "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? And they said, some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets." Over against this popular belief, the faith of the disciples is now called forth. "He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" Now mark how directly the Saviour connects this faith in Peter with the idea of his Church. After assuring him that flesh and blood had not revealed it unto him, he exclaimed, "Thou art Peter, and *upon this rock will I build my Church.*" Here then we evidently have the idea of the Church growing directly out of a true faith in the person of Christ, and, therefore, we say, that in order to the possession of a true churchly spirit, proper views must be entertained in reference to the person of Christ.

The clearest and fullest definition of the doctrine of the person of Christ is furnished us in the Athanasian Creed.

"For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man.

God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world;

Perfect God, and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;

Equal to the Father, according to this Godhead, and inferior to the Father, according to his manhood.

Who, although He be God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; one, not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumption of the manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and man is one Christ."

From this definition, which the Church in all ages has adhered to, we learn that God the Son, the Everlasting Word, who is equal and consubstantial with the Father and the Holy Ghost, took into union with himself human nature, "was made flesh," when he condescended to be born of the Virgin Mary. In his conception and birth he assumed human nature, not as it existed before the fall, but as he found it far down the stream of history in his Virgin Mother. Although, by the power of his divine nature, sin was entirely and forever separated from the human in his person, yet his human nature was laden with all the ills and woes incident to fallen man, and so rested under the curse of the law. Upon Christ rested the burden of sin, and that too not as a merely external burden, but as the necessary and inherent consequence of transgression, and, bearing the heavy load, he went down to death. He met and triumphed over the powers of darkness and raised human nature to a position of honor and glory. Hence we must here make proper account of the Saviour's resurrection and ascension, as constituting true historical developments, in rescuing human nature from the consequences of sin.

It must be at once apparent, that, while the Lord who appeared among the disciples after his resurrection is identical with the Lord who had been with them before, yet a great change had taken place in his person. That change took place in his resurrection. The event of the resurrection was concealed from mortal eyes. "The writers of the

New Testament make mention only of what they themselves saw when the sepulchre was already empty. The creative energies wrought in silence, and unobservedly, and wove for the sublime person of the Lord, a raiment of celestial light, worthy of investing the King of the world of light." The resurrection of Jesus was not merely a return to life as was the resurrection, for example, of Lazarus. It involved, at the same time, a glorification, an entrance into a new and higher order of life. His body of flesh and blood became, in the process of his resurrection, a spiritual body. It was a real, true body, as he assured his disciples afterwards, but it was no longer subject to the ordinary limitations of time and space. When Christ arose, he emerged from time into eternity, from the world of matter into the world of spirit. His full and final glorification took place, of course, only in his ascension to the right hand of the Father. His human nature, thus raised up and glorified, in union with the divine, was no longer limited and confined as before, but went forth freely in the power of the Holy Ghost—to be the life of his people. The descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost was, at the same time, the return of Christ himself in his glorified humanity, according to his promise, "I will not leave you orphans; *I will come to you.*"

Here we have the origin of the Christian Church. The presence of Christ in his people, and their union with him by the power of the Holy Ghost, this constitutes the profound mystery of the Church, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, and here we have the fulfillment of the promise, "Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." To have faith in the presence of the Saviour's glorified humanity in the world, by the power of the Holy Ghost, *is to be churchly.* Over against such faith, all regard and adherence to that which is merely outward and incidental sink into utter insignificancy, but where such faith has once found lodgment in the heart, it will and must invest the outward form with proper significance.

The idea of the Church as a divine institution may be

subverted in two ways, according as our view of the person of Christ runs into one or the other of two errors.

It is not our purpose to go back and go over the two main and leading heresies, in regard to the person of Christ, which prevailed in the early ages of Christianity. Suffice it to say, that they related to the relation of his two natures, the divine and human, and instead of holding to the real, organic union of these in one person, they constantly gave such predominance to the one or the other as to overthrow the true doctrine of his person. On the one side, the Docetic heresies, as they appeared in the gigantic creations of Gnosticism, failed to make due account of the human nature of Christ, resolving his bodily appearance into a mere vision or optical illusion. On the other hand, the Nazarean, or Ebionitic heresy, so undervalued the divinity of Christ as to fail to see in his incarnation a properly new creation at all. All Christological heresies may be said to congregate on these two sides.

In our day they can be distinctly traced, in spirit at least, in what professes to be Protestant Christianity.

First we have Unitarianism, which, although not conceded to be a portion of Evangelical Protestantism, is yet evidently a heretical branch of the Protestant Church. Here we have a denial of the proper divinity of Jesus Christ. We wish to show how this heresy undermines the idea of the Church and is thus fatal to all true churchly feeling.

In denying that Christ is God as well as man, Unitarianism denies, at the same time, the fact of an absolutely *new creation* in him. It also sets aside his generic headship, the organic relation he sustains to his people. Whatever divine influence or power may have dwelt in him, Christ was merely an individual among men, come into the world to make atonement for sin, and to be an example of righteousness. No room is left in this system for the organic union of the divine and human natures, and the perpetual presence of Christ in the Church is denied. Hence, while there may be Christians, there is, properly speaking, no

such thing in the world as an institution, clothed with divine powers, which is, in order, before individual Christians, called *the Church*. Carried out to its ultimate consequences, it leads to humanitarianism, which is a reformation of the world based on man's native powers. As a crutch to get over difficulties that may stand in its way, a sort of pantheism is introduced, a divine afflatus in man, by which he is brought into sympathy with the Deity.

Now it is a notorious fact, that Unitarianism has, from the first, set itself violently against anything bearing the name of Church, in the sense of the Creed, and it has hitherto been its boast, that it deals with men independently of all such organisms, constituting them Christians as individuals and not as members of an order of grace. It is true, in the recent remarkable and able production of Dr. Bellowe of New York, on "The Suspense of Faith," there is manifestly an earnest yearning after the Church, with its supernatural powers, its holy sacraments, its liturgic order of worship; but we regard this, not as the legitimate fruit of the system in which he stands, but rather as a reaction in the direction of the truth. Unitarianism, finding itself houseless and homeless, in being without a *Church*, may make efforts to satisfy this want by attempts at reproducing the outward form; it may institute an order of liturgic worship, resembling in form the ancient order; but its attempts must prove abortive, until it correct its false view of the person of Christ. Till that be done, their Church will be an organism, or the appearance of an organism, without a soul. Christ did not found his Church on a denial, but on a *confession*, of his own proper divinty, which comprehends at the same time his deity.

Secondly, we have in Protestantism, orthodox Protestantism, a spirit which fails to make due account of the *humanity* of Christ.

It is truly amazing, and at the same time most alarming, to observe how little account is made, in a large portion of Protestantism, of the human nature of Christ in the work

of man's redemption. The only necessity for his taking to himself a human body is made to lie in this, that he might thereby prepare himself for death on the cross, sustaining in this way the curse due unto man. That event accomplished, the work of Christ, to all intents and purposes, ceased. The Holy Spirit came into the world to carry forward the work, in bringing men to repentance for sin and faith in this vicarious sacrifice. Christ, as to his humanity at least, is now separated from the world. When it is said, that man approaches God *through* Christ, nothing more is understood than that the approach is made with a reliance upon his merits. "He is the occasion by which men are brought near to God, not the real medium of this approach itself; the cause of the atonement in the divine mind, not the very fact in which it consists, as the self-revelation of God, *at one* with the world, and making the world to be at one with himself."

Under this error, religion becomes a metaphysical system, rather than a living fact. According to a certain theory or system of divinity, God is represented as being reconciled to man, and to understand and receive this theory is to become a Christian. The righteousness of Christ is first set over to the account of man in an outward way, and then the Holy Spirit commences the work of sanctification. Thus the human nature of Christ is not really and truly the medium of our union with God. Hence, also there is no supernatual organism—in which Christ dwells, and properly no Church. Each man is constituted a Christian in his individual capacity, and these individuals, being then associated, form the Church.

Accordingly, we find little said among many Protestant bodies of the *birth of Christ.* The festival which commemorates his entrance into the world is stripped of all its deep significance. His death on the cross is understood to be the great end for which he assumed human nature. Little is said of his human life, and the difficulties that meet us in his life, such as his temptation and his agony in the garden, are resolved into mere appearances.

It is perhaps unnecessary to enlarge further, in giving instances of the workings of this spirit of Gnosticism (for such it unquestionably is) in various branches of the Protestant Church. The efforts it has made, and is still making, to ignore the mystical presence of Christ in the Church, in the sacraments and means of grace, are known to all who have at all observed its workings. It is largely an intellectual system, and becomes in the end cold and dead.

Over against these two errors, a true Christology acknowledges and believes in the divine and human united in the person of Christ. It falters not to say with Thomas, "My Lord and my God," nor with Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." It teaches that God, who made all things by the word of his power, came down into the world, that he united himself with human nature, and that as God and man he continues ever to be the only mediator between God and man. It teaches his constant presence on earth through the Holy Ghost, bringing into union with himself all who believe on his name. Whoever believes in this greatest of all mysteries, must, at the same time, believe in the Church.

II. A second idea which we mention as lying at the basis of a churchly spirit is that of *mystery in religion.*

It is not now again by an arbitray arrangement of our own thoughts, that the idea of the mystical in religion and a churchly spirit are thus brought together. We base this relation upon the passage of Scripture recorded in 2 Timothy 3: 15, 16: "But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is *the Church of the living God*, the pillar and ground of the truth. And without controversy, *great is the* MYSTERY *of godliness*, &c."

One of the leading ideas which absorbed the minds of the Apostles and the early Christians was the great mystery, which challenged their faith, in the revelation of Jesus Christ. The Jews had always been conversant with mysteries. Throughout their entire history, they constantly looked upon things which were incomprehensible to rea-

son. Wonder succeeded wonder. God coming down to hold communion with his people; angels walking upon the earth,—visions and dreams,—prophecies being fulfilled—judgments from heaven—indeed, their whole system was calculated to make them feel that God was among them as he was no where else in the world.

But, in the coming of Christ, the revelation of his glory, the performance of his amazing miracles, his death, resurrection, and ascension to heaven, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, reason was baffled and faith only could receive the revelation. All these things passed before their vision like a heavenly panorama displayed to mortals on earth. The tabernacle of God was with men as it had never been before. All around them were divine and heavenly powers. A new revelation appeared in the old,—all was mystery—a solemn sublime mystery, and they, as children, could only bow down and believe, where mere reason faltered and failed.

A mystery signifies something concealed,—something hidden from ordinary view. In Scripture it generally signifies a revelation which lies above and beyond the sphere of sense or reason. The early Church translated the Greek word *μυστήριον* by the Latin word *sacramentum*, from which we have our English word sacrament. The old definition as given by Augustine, "A sacrament is a sign of a sacred thing," or in other words of the same import, "A sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted for our justification," with which agrees also substantially the answer to the 67th Question in the Heidelberg Catechism, gives us to understand what is meant by a mystery in the Christian sense. The invisible and incomprehensible joining itself to, or revealing itself through that which is visible and comprehensible, or, in other words, the supernatual in the natural,—this constitutes a mystery in the kingdom of grace.

In order to understand the point under consideration, it may be necessary to point out the distinction between a mystery in the natural world, and a mystery in the world

of grace. The growth of a plant in the natural world is a mystery. There is a secret, invisible power lodged in the germ of the seed, which, when the proper conditions are at hand, begins to be active—breaks through the outward shell or covering of the seed, struggles up through the soil, comes forth into the light and air, takes to itself a body, and bears fruit in due season. The feats of legerdemain, performed by the wizard or sorcerer, are, in a lower sense, mysteries, because the power by which they are performed lies hid from observation. But, in each of these cases, there are only natural powers at work. The power that causes the seed to grow, is the vital force which God placed in it at the period of creation, and which propagates itself naturally throughout all time. So too the performances of the wizard are the result of natural powers, and, if we could look behind the scenes, we could understand it all.

In the scheme of redemption, a mystery is not only something concealed from view, but it is also the result of supernatural powers. The foundation of all mysteries in the Christian religion is the incarnation of the Son of God. The Everlasting Word made flesh is the commencement of that union between God and man, the natural and the supernatural, after which the world longed. Here the unseen and eternal revealed itself through the visible and temporal. Of course, this was, and continues to, be a profound mystery, which cannot be fathomed by reason, but must be received by faith.

Now we desire to say, that there is and must be a mystery connected with the Christian religion in all its operations. If we look at the objective features of the Christian system, we shall find mystery there. The preaching of the Gospel is a mystery. We are confronted here already with something more than merely the powers of nature. The reasonableness of the teachings of Scripture, the manner in which they are presented, these will not suffice to explain the success of the Gospel in the world. It must be conceded, that there is a secret invisible power connected with the preaching of the Gospel, which is the cause of its

success. "My words, they are spirit and they are life." The Holy Ghost accompanies and enforces the teachings of Christ, as presented by his ministers. Under this power, strong men are bowed in repentance, darkened minds are enlightened, and hard hearts are melted.

The holy sacraments are mysteries. Here we have invisible grace sacramentally joined with certain outward signs. Here again the supernatural comes to us through the natural. But this union of the two is not mechanical. It cannot be explained on the *opus operatum* theory, which is, at last, a system of magic. But whatever explanation may be offered as to the manner of this mystical union, the fact nevertheless remains. With the outward washing of water there is joined the washing of the Holy Ghost,—with the bread and wine in the holy eucharist, there is joined the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

If we look at the subjective features of religion, we find mysteries there. In the workings of divine grace in the mind and heart, there is a real and true marriage between the natural powers of man, and powers which are supernatural. We may give definitions of repentance and faith, regeneration and sanctification, and other subjective states or experience, but they remain, at last, mysteries, which differ from all natural phenomena, and cannot be explained to the understanding of man.

Wherever a due sense of the mystical element in religion prevails, we think there will be found one element at least of a churchly spirit. This, after all, is what constitutes the Church an object of faith in the sense of the creed, that it is a real kingdom of grace, in which divine and heavenly powers are constantly at work. He, therefore, who apprehends the true mystical element in religion, must have faith in the Church. At war with this mystical element in religion is rationalism, which is at the same time at war with all true churchliness. Whenever the mind refuses to concede anything above nature and reason in the various phenomena of religion, there is an end of all mystery. The miracles recorded in the Old and New Testa-

ments are then explained away as mere natural events, or at most deceptive appearances; the word and sacraments are divested of their true character, and religion turned into a delusion. A rationalist, in the full sense of the word, must be also an infidel. But the poison of rationalism may diffuse itself in combination with a measure of true faith. This is the case largely, we think, with Protestantism. The intellect has been made to play so large a part in its history from its beginning, as a reaction against its neglect and enslavement previously, that there is great danger of its trusting too much in its own light. There are denominations, among whom *mystery* is almost an obsolete word, and when used by others, they consider it a bad indication. Who does not know how lustily a certain American divine, and certain American Churches cried out, not many years since, against regarding the Lord's Supper as a mystery, or against believing in the mystical presence of Christ in that holy sacrament? And who does not know, that, with a large portion of American Protestantism, the idea of mystery connected with the sacrament at all is regarded as superstitious? And just to that extent they are also *unchurchly*. No man can make due account of the idea of the Church, who does not sympathize with the mystical element of the Christian religion. He can have no reverence, except as he feels himself standing in the presence of the supernatural. He can have no true faith in the Church, unless he can see in it the revelation of divine power and grace. There is undoubtedly wanting to a large extent in Protestantism precisely this sense of mystery. Owing to the fact, that the Reformation was a waking up of the world's intellect, as well as a reformation of abuses in religion,—and owing to the rise of a sensational philosophy, which finds its legitimate fruit in the Positive philosophy of Le Comté, mystery has been well nigh ruled out of religion. Knowledge has taken the place of faith, and men rush madly in where angels fear to look.

But, as intimated above, the conception of mystery in religion may be overthrown by uniting the natural and

supernatural in a *magical* way. This, we think, is the defect in the Roman Catholic system. In that system, there is no real union of the order of grace and the order of nature. "The two worlds are sundered by an impassable gulph, as regards inward constitution and being; only by the word of God, as an outward report, it is possible for faith, in the sphere of nature, to be infallibly assured of what lies beyond in the higher sphere. This abstract conception of the supernatural, as something that refuses utterly to flow into one life in any way with the natural, underlies the whole theory of Romanism." Hence the faith and reverence, which are due only to the supernatural, are transferred at last to the merely natural, and become superstition. We will not pursue this thought further at this time, but proceed to remark,

III. *The idea of a liturgic order of worship* is another element of a churchly spirit.

This proposition may be demonstrated historically. It will be found in examining the history of the Christian past, that, from the beginning, a liturgic order of worship has always stood in connection with a sound churchly feeling, and *vice versa*. In the primitive ages of Christianity the idea of the Church was all-absorbing. The early Christians felt themselves standing in an order of grace, which was to them a truly supernatural kingdom. Of this kingdom they were living *members*. Their individual Christian life was regarded as healthy only as it flowed forth freely from this kingdom of heaven on earth. Now, it is well known, that this was, at the same time, the age of liturgies. Worship was then regarded as an act of the Church, and not merely of individuals in the Church. It was the voice of the Saviour's spouse, which was one, going forth from a warmly beating heart to Him who is the chief among ten thousand, the one altogether lovely. It is also true, that, since the period of the Reformation, those branches of the Protestant Church which realize most their organic connection with the Holy Catholic Church of all ages, have the deepest sympathy with a liturgical order of

worship, whereas among those denominations and sects where the idea of the Church is, to a great extent, lost, there is also a repugnance to all liturgies. The question here is, not which is right. We are not now arguing the merits of the case, but merely directing attention to a historical fact. Churchly feeling and liturgical worship may both be condemned as wrong, as contrary to the teachings and spirit of Christ, yet the fact remains that they always go together.

But our proposition may also be demonstrated philosophically. The Church, as it is confessed in the Apostles' creed, is one and indivisible. It was the burden of the Saviour's last prayer, that it might continue thus united to the end of time. "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may know that thou hast sent me." If this character of unity is to be a reality, and not a mere empty name, it behooves that the voice of the Church must be one when it ascends in worship to the throne of God. It is often urged, indeed, that the unity here spoken of is a unity of spirit, and that it therefore has no immediate reference to the outward form or language employed. But where there is true unity of spirit, there must, in the nature of the case, be unity in outward form. Life always struggles to actualize itself, and it can fail to do this only where there are stronger foreign powers at work. The acts of public worship are not merely the acts of individual believers, but of the whole body of believers. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is truly a *communion* in which all have part. The offering up of prayer and praise is an act in which the whole Church engages. The Saviour teaches this in his formula of prayer given to his disciples. When ye pray, say, "*Our* Father who art in heaven." The prayer must be one which expresses the wants and feelings of all,—it must be universal in its character.

A liturgic order of worship, not only brings out prominently the idea of the *unity* of the Church, but also its *objectivity*. The Church as the body of Christ, a new order

of grace, and therefore an object of faith, presents itself before us as something more general and comprehensive than the subjective experiences, or the sum of subjective experiences, in individual Christians. It is, in order, before individual Christians, just as the net in the parable is something apart from the fishes which formed its contents. As the family life, or the national life, is something broader and deeper than that of the individuals comprehended in it, so the life of the Church is always broader, and more comprehensive than that of its members.

Now, in worship, the member of the Church is to rise above his subjective state or experience and mingle his note of praise in that which is general. The general life of the Church stands united with Christ who is in heaven, as to the fulness of his majesty and glory. It stands in sympathy with heavenly things and all its members are to enter into this fellowship. This is what the Church has always meant by its *Sursum corda*, "Lift up your hearts," and the response, "We lift them up unto the Lord." This is what is meant by saying in the solemn prayer, "We unite with angels and archangels around thy throne, with the glori ous company of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs and saints in heaven, as well as with thy militant Church on earth, in ascribing unto Thee honor and blessing, thanksgiving and praise. Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God of Hosts: heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory." In the language of another, "The Liturgical prayer is objective, it looks to heaven, it worships with angels, it moves amidst bodily realities, and it prays for spiritual things under tangible forms: thus leading the individual out of himself, and turning the particular voice of his private devotions into the one great voice of the Body, which is the Church." The same might be said of all the other official acts of worship.

Now where the Church is comprehended in its *Unity* and its *Objectivity*, there must be a churchly spirit, and there must be also, as has been shown, a Liturgical order of worship. It is not without meaning, therefore, we think

that the Mercersburg movement, after earnestly presenting the great, germinative doctrine of the person of Christ, setting forth the Incarnation as lying at the foundation of Christianity, and the mystical presence of Christ as the life of the Church, should now make earnest with the Liturgy Question. There is an internal bond of union between these. But on this account they must be held, not separately, but together. To advocate liturgic forms, without, at the same time, being imbued with a proper conception of what goes before, would be senseless formalism. A liturgy without a Church would be an ironical satire on the spirit of sect and schism.. Hence the liturgy movement cannot advance properly any faster than the minds and hearts of the people become imbued with a true faith in the Church. When this has fully taken root, a liturgic order of worship will follow as a necessary consequence.

It might be suggested here, if such kind of worship is the only proper kind, why not join in that of the Roman Catholic, or Episcopal Church? The objection to the order of worship in the Roman Catholic Church, among other objections, is this, that there the worship is conducted by the clergy, and the people are entirely shut out. True the people read their prayers—and the choir engages to some extent, but the language of the missal is only for the clergy. This objection does not hold as against the Episcopal Church. But here the objection is, that their exclusive, and perhaps we may say, selfish theory of the Church, shuts out their Protestant brethren from joining with them in worship on an equality. Hence there seems to be no other alternative left, than for the other Protestant bodies to produce, or reproduce, an order of worship adapted to their wants. The times are looking towards this end. We believe it will yet be accomplished.

IV. Proper respect and reverence for the holy ministry, is another characteristic of a churchly spirit.

It will not be difficult, from what has already been said of some of the fundamental ideas of true churchliness, to

obtain a correct conception of the character and functions of the holy ministry. These must rest ultimately upon the constitution of the person of Christ. The functions of the holy ministry are not based upon an external commission merely, but upon something going before the commission. It was because Christ himself was the world's prophet, priest, and king, and that this threefold ministry was to be of perpetual force, that he was qualified to commission his disciples and their successors throughout all ages, to go forth and act in his name.

The ministry, therefore, is not something created *ab extra*, but it is rather the continuation of the ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ. Accordingly, his words, "Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world," express a literal truth. It is not as though he had said, I will support and sustain you; I will give you all necessary encouragement and success. It means, that Christ will ever continue to live and act in the functions of his true ministers, and therefore *he* will be with them.

The functions of the ministry must, therefore, be regarded as truly supernatural. They proceed not from any merely natural or human power. Neither are they delegated from the people constituting the Church militant at any given stage of its history. The powers here come from above, not from beneath. It is true, the laity have a voice in designating the persons who are to be invested with these solemn functions, but they do not create the functions themselves.

But now it must not be overlooked, that, in the ministry there is a real union of the natural and the supernatural. We cannot separate absolutely between the official and personal character of the Christian minister. Here the weakness of the Roman system again reveals itself. According to this system, there is, in theory, an absolute divorce between these two, and the effect has been, that, not only in exceptional cases, and for a time, but as a general rule and for centuries, a large portion of their ministers have given sad evidence of being priests without being

Christians. Undoubtedly there has been much shameful misrepresentation on this point. History has been turned into a nose of wax but too frequently, in the hands of partisans and bigots, in order to bring reproach on the system. In many instances history, thus abused, has righted itself again, and it has been made to appear that many popes and priests, who had been covered with the slime of base vituperation, were really honest and upright, yea, even eminent servants of God, and faithful ministers of Christ. No one can read such a volume as *Edgar's Variations of Popery*, without being filled with *nausea* at the manner in which the author luxuriates in filthy misrepresentations.

But, conceding all this, it is still a matter of history, which the fingers of time will never efface, that the Romish priesthood has often become corrupt, and the cause may be found largely in the false view of the ministry to which reference has been made. The priest and the man are regarded as two beings. With them this is the rule, not the exception. Their people do not seem to be at all horrified, therefore, in having wicked popes and priesthood to dispense the functions of the gospel ministry. They will tell you with an air of unconcern and even apparent complacency, "if the priest is bad, he is bad for himself, not for us." Yet who cannot see that this is making a principle out of an exception? If the principle were true, then the functions of the ministry could go forward successfully even in the hands of an entirely corrupt priesthood, which is certainly impossible for any length of time.

The case requires indeed, that we should distinctly recognize the supernatural character of the functions of the ministry, but we must not, at the same time, overlook or ignore the Christian character of those who exercise them.

But, if Romanism errs on the one side, a large portion of Protestantism has erred on the other. It is not to be concealed, that, in many branches of Protestantism, the official character of the ministry is entirely lost sight of. With them the minister of the gospel wields no supernatural power whatever. His influence and success are re-

garded as depending entirely upon his personal qualifications. Ministers themselves, entertaining this same view, turn out moral reformers; their churches are turned into lecture rooms, and they entertain large audiencies by able and polished lectures on questions of the day.

Now it will be found that the Christian ministry, which rests its claims upon either of these errors will, in the end, prove a failure. The Romish priesthood could not stand before the tide of reformatory movement induced by reigning immoralities in the Church, and Protestant ministers, who fall into the other extreme, will be landed on the bleak and barren shore of humanitarianism, which never yet regenerated a single soul, while the stream of true Church life will roll majestically onward to its final destination.

From this we can see at once what respect and reverence are due the Christian ministry. They combine in themselves the character of a private Christian and of a public minister of Jesus Christ. As the continuation of the Saviour's prophetical office, they are the regularly constituted organs of instruction. They are the *ecclesia docens*. They are not called to teach systems of philosophy, or to disseminate their individual opinions and notions on any and every subject, but they are to make known the great system of faith which is entrusted to their keeping. The Apostles spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The Christian minister, in like manner, must feel himself bound to proclaim that which he is sent to teach. In the present state of the Church, he is bound by the symbolical books of his denomination. Thus he preaches always in an official character, and delivers a message first delivered to him. He does not do this, indeed, in a mechanical way. The truths must pass through his own mind; and his own heart too, and be reproduced for his hearers, yet the truths are not his own, but Christ's. As the continuation of the Saviour's priestly office, he is to offer up the sacrifice of thanksgiving and praise in behalf of the people. The central arch in this department of the work of the Christian

ministry is the Holy Eucharist, which they are called to dispense. Flowing forth from this are the prayers and songs of praise, with which the Church approaches God in solemn worship. These ascend in connection with the Eucharist or *thanksgiving*, in which the atonement of Christ is brought really home to all believers, and through which they offer themselves up as living sacrifices. As a continuation of the Saviour's kingly office, the Christian ministry, including ruling elders as well as teaching elders, are to govern the Church of Christ. In the use of the keys entrusted to their keeping, they are to open and shut the door of the kingdom of divine grace by the preaching of the Gospel and Christian discipline. They are not to be lords over God's heritage, ruling with a tyrannical spirit, but they must nevertheless rule and govern, though in a spirit of humility and love.

The respect and reverence due to the Christian ministry are based now upon their character as already briefly sketched. In exceptional cases where we may reasonably believe their personal characters are bad, yet so long as they stand *rectus in ecclesia*, they must be regarded with due respect. Their ministerial acts are valid. But the proper condition is only realized, when the love we bear to them, as Christians, is combined with respect and reverence for them as ministers. Jesus Christ manifested all due deference to officials in the Jewish Church, even though he had to denounce them as vile hypocrites. He always responded to their demands when exercising their official character, and encouraged the people to pay all due regard to their instruction, because they sat in Moses' seat. What a humiliating contrast is presented in reference to this point in our day! Is not the contrast owing to the general prevalence of an unchurchly spirit? Who lower the standard of qualifications for the ministry? Who have labored to do away with all distinctions between the ministry and the laity? There can be no hesitation in answering these questions. The sects,—who are a standing denial of the one holy catholic Church,—they ignore the

high and holy charecter of the ministry. On the other hand, wherever proper views of the Church prevail, there the ministry will be respected. No man can love Christ and believe in his Church, and yet show habitual disrespect for his ministers.

The evil here brought to view is not to be remedied, as we think, until right views of the Church, as the body of Christ, come to prevail; and right views of the Church depend again on right views of the person of Christ, and of the nature of Christianity. Any merely outward application, or outward reform, will not be lasting. To insist merely on an outward succession in the Episcopal sense is not enough. A pedantic assumption of a clerical dress and clerical manners, will avail but little. There must be a lively faith first in the perpetual presence and power of the *ministry of Christ*, as he lives in the Church, in the way of a profound mystery, a faith in the presence of divine and heavenly powers, and when such faith prevails, respect and reverence for the office bearers in the Church will manifest itself in due time. Apart from such faith all will be empty and vain.

Again, reverence for the house of God, and a suitable regard for church-architecture are the natural and necessary result of true churchliness. The house of God is made sacred by the presence of God's worshipping people, in the midst of whom Christ himself is present, according to his gracious promise, "Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." From the beginning of the world, God himself has inculcated the duty of reverencing places specially set apart for the revelation of his presence and glory. Such a place was the spot on which, in ancient days, the altar was erected; such a place was the vicinity of the burning bush; such a place was the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple. It is not now indeed Mt. Gerizzim nor Mt. Sion that we are to regard as peculiarly sacred, but in whatever place God's people choose to strike their tents, or build houses for his worship. In these temples of prayer and praise something

more than the shekinah of the holy of holies in the Jewish temple, is present. Because this presence of Christ is a spiritual presence, it is none the less real. What a sad commentary on the character of much of the religion of the day, and the faith of this age, is the spirit of irreverence so generally manifested for the house of God!

Due reverence for the house of God will lead to a proper regard for Church-architecture. The house of the Lord must be the best we can prepare. It is erected for the honor and glory of God in preference to our own convenience and comfort. It is to be lamented that in many churches this order is reversed. You may often find richly cushioned pews to accommodate the people, whilst the pulpit and the altar are left uncared for. In churches that cost fifty or a hundred thousand dollars, frequently nothing but an ordinary speaker's desk is erected, from which to expound and proclaim the everlasting Gospel, and an ordinary table from which to dispense the holy sacraments and offer up prayer and praise. Should not this be changed? The people can worship in plain seats, but the sacredness of the pulpit and the altar should be adapted to inspire all with reverence and awe.

The idea of worship also, as a liturgical service, demands a proper regard for the character of the building in which such worship is offered up. It must not only be adapted in its proportions for the voice of the speaker, as a lecture room, but it should also express the uprising of prayer and praise. To this end it points upwards, like its towering spire, to the skies, whither the earnest longings and aspirations of all true worshipers tend. Everything in and about it should bring home to the mind and heart the sacredness of the place and of the service. There is indeed a theory according to which all such outward expression of religious sentiment and feeling is unnecessary,—the theory which regards religious service as exclusively spiritual. The consistent and legitimate conclusion of this theory is reached in the graveyard silence and ghostlike worship of Quakerism. It is contradicted, however, by the common

sense of the whole Christian world, which arrays itself in Sunday dress, to hallow the Lord's day and prepare for solemn worship. Religion is for the body as well as for the spirit, and these two are inseparable in our present state of existence.

Regard for holy seasons pertains also to a churchly spirit. Christianity sanctifies the revolving years by which time is measured. It is moreover historical, and must, therefore, constantly keep before the mind its great historical events. But we will not pursue our subject farther in this direction. Our object has been rather to collect together a few leading ideas which lie at the basis of a churchly spirit. There is danger, in this superficial age, that the remedy proposed to satisfy the great want of Christendom may prove an abortion,—that we may grasp at the conclusion without digesting well the premises,—that we may put on a dress which will be only a sad mimicry. The "Church of the future" must be a true birth from the life of the present. We believe there are hopeful indications of the dawn of a more auspicious day for God's struggling militant people. Party divisions must sooner or later come to an end. Love and unity must prevail. Yet we must patiently abide the time for history to shape its course. It is questionable whether Protestantism has yet expended all its centrifugal force. It would seem that divisions will for a time continue to multiply. Doubtless some of the bodies that have been thrown off, and have been revolving around themselves as centres, will perish in darkness. But we have hope for the main elements of Protestantism, because we have faith in history, and especially Christian history, one of the legitimate movements of which was evidently the great Reformation of the sixteenth century. But history is not regulated by unalterable fate. Its factors on the one side are free agents. Hence the Protestant world must become conscious of its mission. It must look earnestly towards the final overthrow of sect and schism, or else perish. Nothing will contribute so much, we think, to this end as the cultivation, in all its

branches, of a *true churchly spirit.* May the good Lord hasten the time, when all his people shall be one in outward form, as they are one in inward life, when there shall be one fold as there is one Shepherd,—when, the world over, there shall be "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism."

T. G. A.

ART. III.—THE CHURCH AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS*.

Mankind may be contemplated in two leading aspects. The one exhibits a race of *sinners*, fallen and condemned, and as such needing a *spiritual* salvation. The other aspect exhibits a race of *sufferers*, because they are fallen sinners, or implicated in sin as it has become dominant in the world, and as such sufferers needing *physical* salvation. Now it depends almost entirely upon the subjective character of our piety, of Christianity as living in us, by which of these aspects we will be most deeply affected, or whether each will receive, in its own proper measure, the consideration to which it is entitled.

Those whose religion rests entirely upon convictions of the holiness of God, and whose piety consists in all-absorbing meditations of the Divine justice, will be likely to be most deeply moved by the sight of man as a *sinner*, and the consideration of his impending doom as a sinner. All their thoughts about him, are suggested by that name, and fasten on it. They see him in no other light than as a rebel against God. The term *sinner* expresses the only relation to God in which they care to regard man, and designates the only character of man which they deem worthy of earnest anxiety. It matters little or nothing to them whether he be blind, or deaf, or naked, or hungry,

* The Charity of Primitive Churches, &c. By the Rev. Stephen Chastel. Translated by G. A. Matile. Philadelphia. 1857.

or halt, or maimed, or sick, or in prison. His being a sinner so exceeds in fearfulness all other possible conditions, that they lose all significance. And if he can only be rescued from that evil, all other evils may well be borne. This phase of piety, also, true to its spiritualistic convictions, generally leaves men lie unpitied and unrelieved in their various physical woes, if only they are saved; that is, if only their souls are pardoned and redeemed. Why should the hungry poor sigh over their scanty crusts, if only they may eat bread in the kingdom of heaven? Why should half-clad orphans shiver in their rags, if only they may say, "Our Father who art in heaven," and can warm their souls in the rays of love which fall from the Cross? Why should widows weep in their lonely bereavments, and pine away in their desertion, if only "their Maker has come to be their husband," and they have attained to a good hope through grace, of a better portion hereafter? Sinners should be thankful that they are saved, and bear the lack of other good, and the burden of other ills, with patience, and grateful resignation.

We do not affirm that with the phase of Christianity just considered, theory or doctrine and such practice, are always associated. But abundant facts, past and present, will corroborate the assertion, that its strong and most prevalent tendency is in the direction indicated.

That such an extreme positive should have its extreme and counteracting negative, is only in harmony with all the phenomena of matter and of mind. Accordingly we find that the aspect of mankind as *sufferers* has so absorbed the attention and excited the sympathies of another class of Christians, or at least Religionists, that every other characteristic of man is lost sight of or ignored. The sight of physical suffering or temporal wretchedness so affects them, that they have no sighs for diseased souls, and no concern for desperate spiritual maladies. With such, *philanthrophy*, in its lowest sense, is religion, and temporal beneficence the only desirable form of piety. In their estimation almshouses are far preferable to churches, and

meetings of beneficial associations more important to the welfare of society than public worship. If only men have bread, and children clothing; if only widows are housed, and the suffering sick nursed; if only dying men can be assured that they will be decently buried, and their bereaved survivors somewhat cared for,—why should any desire or need more than this? There are men, and men professing to have learned at the feet of one who taught wiser lessons of duty than ever Gamaliel uttered, who nevertheless would rather see a slave free of his temporal bondage, than see him a Christian. There is, indeed, that in this error to which every warm heart responds. Though it rests upon a *perverted* humanity, we cannot refuse or wholly suppress sympathy with the *humanity* that is in it. But as a perversion of a great truth and duty, and that to the exclusion of a still greater truth and duty, it must be rejected and denounced. If those of the previously named class allow their high sense of the holiness of God, their indignation at sinners as offenders against that holiness, and their concern for those offenders as obnoxious to extreme penalties, to render them comparatively indifferent to the claims of men, as physical sufferers, upon their sympathies; those who belong to this second class are so overwhelmed by scenes of human sorrow and shrieks of human wo, that, in their tender concern for the afflicted, and philanthropic zeal to alleviate those physical miseries, they comparatively forget that sin is the primal source of all these sorrows, and that man's first need is pardon and reconciliation with God. The former are exclusive theists; the latter exclusive humanists.

Now it is obvious to the student of Revelation, and especially of the morality of the Bible as exemplified by Christ, that Christianity gives no warrant to either of these extremes. The first concern of every man for himself, should doubtless be to seek a living participation in "the kingdom of God and his righteousness." And, consequently, the benevolent zeal of those who have attained this, should lead them *primarily* to labor to bring others to a like

participation in spiritual blessings. But Christianity, and as especially illustrated by our Lord himself, is no less explicit in inculcating similar zeal for the relief of the physical sufferings of mankind. For "*Pure Religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.*" (James 1 : 27.)

There are impure and defiled Religions in the world; Religions which originated in the depths of foul hearts, and which, instead of cleansing and ennobling their deluded votaries, have only caused them to sink still deeper in the mire. The utterly degrading influence of all pagan forms of religion, is too well known to need any special illustrations. Now as those religions are low and brutalizing in their nature and moral influence, so they are also uniformly characterized by cruelty and inhumanity in their social workings.

But even our essentially holy Christian Religion has not escaped contamination, in its progress amidst the vile idolatries of the world. Its principles have often been perverted. Its worship has frequently been adulterated. And its living acting charity has, alas! how commonly, been worse than neutralized by bitter infusions of hateful bigotry. Orthodoxy, frigid and dead, has been substituted for righteousness of life; formalism (whether premeditated or extemporaneous) for hearty devotion; and sectarian fanaticism, for holy zeal, in the service of God and of our brother, God's son. Oh! how miserably has that "wisdom which is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, *full of mercy and good fruits*," been falsified by ecclesiastical and sectarian caricatures!

No wonder then that the earnest practical Apostle above quoted, draws so strong a contrast between such counterfeit forms of piety, and genuine Christianity. In opposition to all those deceptive and inefficient imitations, he declares that "pure Religion, and undefiled before God and the Father, is this: To visit the fatherless and widows

in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." This only is true religion in the case of individuals separately considered; but this, also, is the most effective and worthy form in which the piety of Christians collectively—as a Church—can be exhibited.

He does not deny the importance and necessity of a ground-work of faith. How could he? The same Spirit which inspired Paul, inspired James. Their doctrines, therefore, must essentially agree. And they do agree. Both teach that faith is indispensable to salvation; only St. Paul gives more prominence to faith, because he was addressing those (especially in the epistle to the Galatians) —who were in danger of relying upon righteousness by works. Both teach that works are indispensable; only St. James, who had witnessed a tendency to trust in a mere inactive faith, gives prominence to their importance, as the legitimate fruit of faith; and the proper evidence of its existence in the hearts of those professing to possess it.

And yet this representation of the relation of St. Paul to St. James, may hardly exhibit the matter in its true light. For St. Paul does give as much prominence, in fact, to the *fruits* of the Spirit, to "a faith that *worketh* by love," to deeds of charity, as irresistibly prompted by the principle of indwelling charity, as could be expected in epistles, the aim of which would have justified no greater stress being laid upon this view of piety. And so, on the other hand, St. James, instead of at all ignoring the vitalizing power of faith, makes it, wherever it exists, a living fountain whence issue streams of charity to gladden the hearts of the desolate.

The truth is that the danger of separating theory and practice, so as to substitute the one for the other, is exposed in every book of the New Testament. How explicitly is it everywhere affirmed, that "except our righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, we can in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven;" that men are "made new creatures in Christ Jesus," in order that as "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy

nation, a peculiar people, they may shew forth the praises of him who hath called them out of darkness into his marvellous light." Thus are they challenged to "glorify God in their bodies and spirits which are his." And the way in which prëeminently, as true believers, they are to do this, is, by exemplifying the power and beauty of Religion in the form specified by St. James.

The alleviation of human misery, as a prominent duty of Christians and the Christian Church, is, therefore, a theme warmly commended by the statutes and practice of our holy Religion, and the more especially deserving of earnest attention, as it is apt to be underrated and overlooked.

We propose devoting a few pages to its consideration.

The duty in question is plainly taught in the Scriptures by reiterated precepts, and strongly enforced by numerous examples.

Passing by the many proofs in point which might be cited from the Old Testament Scriptures, let us notice: *The teaching and example of Christ and his apostles.*

So strong, and seemingly unqualified, are some of the *declarations of our Lord*, touching this subject, that they have not only been made to favor agrarian and communistic errors, but have troubled the consciences of not a few simple hearted, yet serious and earnest Christians. It would seem as though he required his disciples to strip themselves of all their possessions, and distribute them among their destitute and suffering fellow men. Nay, not only that he has enjoined this upon them as a proper act of self-denial, but has seemed to make it a condition of salvation.

He represents those whom he welcomes as the blessed of his Father, into the joys of their Lord, as being persons who, when even the least of his brethren on earth were hungry, gave them meat; when they were thirsty, gave them drink; when they were strangers, took them in; when they were naked, clothed them; when they were sick, visited them; and when they were in prison, went to cheer them. From this it would seem as though the piety which

Christ desired to recommend, consisted mainly of beneficence, as springing from faith.

When he sent forth his twelve disciples on their first mission, what strange prominence he gives to acts of mercy towards the bodies of men. "He gave them power and authority over all demons, and to heal diseases, and all manner of sickness." And again when he sent forth the seventy, he invested them with like power over all bodily complaints, both such as seemed connected immediately with the agency of some evil spirit, and those which did not.

At another time he rebukes the prevailing disposition to pay court to wealth and worldly estate, and commands his followers, when they give public entertainments, to invite such guests as proud and selfish worldlings despise. "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, nor thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbors; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou shalt be blessed: for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

To the same effect is our Lord's approval of the conduct of Zaccheus, in giving *the half of his goods to feed the poor*, whether this means that he intended at once to make distribution of that proportion of his effects, or to give the half of his annual revenues to their relief. This is set forth by Christ as the most indubitable evidence of the publican's conversion,—a most cheering proof that salvation, with its regenerating power, had indeed come to his house.

Thus he everywhere admonishes his followers to make such a beneficent use of what riches they may possess, as will secure the divine approbation, the friendship and favor of Him, who, when they shall fail, can receive them into everlasting habitations.

And what our Lord so impressively taught, he *exemplified* in his whole life. What was that life but a continuous act of self-sacrifice to the relief of the wretched, and the

deliverance of the lost? He knew that he had been anointed not only to preach the Gospel to the poor, but to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. Therefore he went about doing good. He came to minister, not to be ministered unto. The works of Him that sent him, which he so untiringly wrought, were deeds of mercy to the miserable and helpless. When John the Baptist sent to our Lord for proofs of his Messiahship, Jesus could, therefore, triumphantly point to the miracles of beneficence which he had performed. By his divine pity, therefore, he has taught his disciples to be compassionate, and full of tender sympathy for all that are in distress. By his zeal in seeking out and aiding the wretched, he has set them an example which should incite their awakened sympathies to diligent and self-denying efforts to alleviate the woes of our suffering fellowmen. And by the blessed results which followed his labors of love, he stimulates their zeal by assurances that their toils shall not be in vain in the Lord.

Accordingly, when we consider the precepts, and contemplate the bright and inspiring example of our Divine Redeemer, we may well wonder less, that ardent hearts have allowed themselves to be inflamed by overwrought enthusiasm in imitation of what he said and did—than that so many of his followers should exhibit utter apathy, and frigid insensibility to human sorrow. It is true that enthusiasm has often flamed out into fanaticism, and sought to accomplish its aims in most unscriptural and repulsive forms. But it is hardly becoming for those who do nothing, to condemn others for doing too much. No calm and sober judgment, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, will ever construe the Saviour's words or acts into a warrant for socialism, or any kindred error. But how can men be ever looking unto such a Jesus, and be daily admiring such beneficence, without having their own souls stirred within them to go and do likewise?

That this duty should be *reiterated by the immediate apostles and disciples* of our Lord, and that their lives should *furnish corresponding exemplifications of it*, must seem altogether natural. Accordingly we find the Acts of the Apostles, and their Epistles abounding in exhortations to deeds of mercy, not only towards suffering fellow-believers, but also towards strangers. They urged their brethren to be instant in season and out of season, "doing good unto all men, but especially unto them who were of the household of faith."

It is not St. James, but St. Paul, who, under the influence of the Spirit, says: "I have showed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said: It is more blessed to give than to receive." (Acts 20: 35.) "Therefore, charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come." And in full harmony with this doctrine of St. Paul, the aged apostle John, asks: "But whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" This is but a scanty specimen of exhortations and directions abounding in the writings of the Apostles. We cannot now quote more. But they are sufficient to show how explicitly, and how earnestly the duty of beneficence, in forms suited to the varied circumstances of the needy and afflicted, was urged upon the members of the Apostolic Church.

And in the case of the Apostles, likewise, *precepts were illustrated by a consistent example.* They denied themselves, took up their cross, and followed Christ. Silver and gold they might have none, but what they had they cheerfully consecrated to the service of the brethren, and the cause of human beneficence. They not only died for Christ and

his people;—they did more, they *lived for them*. And they lived for them, not simply and solely by being the bearers of the Gospel as a system of saving facts and doctrines, or as a heavenly devised scheme for exhibiting to the world, in the most awe-inspiring form, the severe and unchangeable righteousness of God (Rom. 1 : 17); but also, and very decidedly, by manifesting in their own lives, how tender-hearted, how pitiful, and how abundant in deeds of mercy to others that Gospel taught them, and all who truly embraced it, ever to be. They lived frugally, that they might not too heavily tax the churches in their comparative indigence. They labored with their own hands, not thereby to concede their right to ample maintenance by public provision, or to set a precedent which covetous Christians, and penurious churches might subsequently, in more prosperous days, plead as an apology for keeping their pastors on economical fare—(for it was plainly asserted that the ox that treadeth out the grain should not be muzzled), but they did so for two different reasons. In the first place they were unwilling to be burdensome to their poverty-stricken brethren, who, under losses sustained in many cases by their embracing the Gospel, were hardly able to provide for themselves. Then the apostles desired by their own manual labors to earn means of assisting the needy and distressed. Thus they proved that, although man was not to live by material bread alone, but by every word proceeding from the mouth of the Lord, nevertheless, it was a Christian duty to give the hungry bread. Like their Master, they might perceive that many among the multitudes following them, were influenced only by carnal motives, hoping to get food to satisfy their bodily hunger, and such carnality might be rebuked by them. Still like that Divine Master, also, they did not, therefore, refuse to exert their miraculous gift for the relief of the blind, and lame, and sick, nor to put into active exercise the spirit of Christian love, even at the entire sacrifice of personal comfort, for the benefit of their suffering fellow-men.

The general recognition of this duty in the early ages of the Church, and the various measures employed in its discharge,—furnish corroborative proof of its claims.

During the Apostolic period the duty to care for the needy, and minister to the wants of the wretched, seems to have been unhesitatingly admitted, by all the members of the Church. They held all things as common to all: *i. e.*—those who had possessions really regarded themselves as holding their riches in trust for the good of their needy brethren. Poor widows and their orphan children were objects of special regard. To those who had suffered losses through persecution, pecuniary relief, contributed by more fortunate churches, was liberally sent. A special office was instituted, with reference to the execution of some formally devised plan of beneficence. Alas! that the significance of the diaconate is scarcely known in these last days! The *agapae*, feasts of love, were no less than public meals, furnished by the more wealthy Christians, at which the poor enjoyed freely the same fare with their richer brethren. And these feasts were daily spread. The poor took the fragments home with them, to supply the next day's wants. None were allowed to suffer for lack of any thing. They served one another in the Lord.

So deeply was the force of this obligation felt that it overcame all the previously existing prejudices of nation and caste. Disputes and jealousies might occasionally arise. But soon the law of love would assert its sway, and Jew and Gentile be found by turns, mutually aiding each other, in obedience to the strong promptings of celestial charity.

There were, indeed, no public institutions of charity, as asylums for the poor or the sick, then yet reared. For, first of all, there was *no need of them* in the Church. All requisite provision for such objects of pity was made by private and individual liberality and benevolence. In the household of faith, there was always found room to shelter, feed, and protect, the destitute and helpless members of that household. The house of Stephanas was but one

among many, "addicted to the ministry of the saints" (Cor. 16 : 15). Then, furthermore, the spite and jealosy of their foes, would not have allowed the early Christians to give such public demonstrations of the law of charity. And, again, the political agitations of those times were barriers in the way of such benevolent establishments. But by the collections taken on the first day of the week, and other acts of private munificence, the needy were comfortably cared for, and the homeless housed.

It was this fact which attracted the notice of surrounding Gentiles, and forced from them the declaration: "See how these Christians love one another!" It was not the exhibition of any sentimental affection; not merely that they lived together in harmony and peace, whilst intestine feuds, and unrelenting strifes, made other communities boisterous with discords. This indeed was comparatively true. But the most prominent characteristic was, that they abounded in deeds of mutual charity; bore each others burdens; did good in communicating to each others necessities; were hospitable; remembered them that were in bonds, as bound with them; and them which suffer adversity, as being themselves in the body (Hebrew 13 : 3).

Nor did the cause of Christian beneficence wane as the Apostles one after another passed away, and no longer stirred up the Churches by their inciting presence and appeals. Nay, during the several centuries succeeding the primitive period, the spirit of genuine compassion, and of activity in deeds of mercy, often exerted, apparently at least, greater power, than ever before. As opportunities multiplied and means increased, there seemed to be a growing disposition to turn both to account. Sometimes, in our day, we are taken with joyful surprise, by a newspaper paragraph announcing munificent bequests to some literary or benevolent institution. But bright as these examples of liberality are, they are almost eclipsed—both in their extent and their aim—by many reported in the histories of the early ages of Christianity.

Cyprian, the heir of great estates, disposed of all, not

even reserving his gardens near to Carthage, and made distribution of the proceeds among the poor. And after he became Bishop of Carthage, he on one occasion raised a sum equal to $4000 for the redemption of some Numidian christians, who had been carried away captive by neighboring barbarians, and in forwarding the amount to them, begged them not to hesitate to ask for more if it were needed.

Marcion, (who subseqnently became a heretic) gave $40,000 to the Church at Sinope (of which his father was Bishop)—for charitable purposes, whilst he was still a reophyte.

It became a rule, moreover, to appropriate one third of the ordinary income of the churches, for the relief of the unfortunate.

Among these objects of compassion and help were aged men and woman, the infirm, all incapable of working, and those whose income was insufficient for their maintenance. Special attention was paid to orphans, and exposed children. When no others offered to take them in charge, they were placed under the pastor's or bishop's care, and properly provided for and trained. Cornelius of Rome reports, about 250, that his Church was then sustaining more than 1500 poor, such as widows, and persons afflicted with different evils. During a severe famine which followed the long wars of Gallienus in that same century, a plague broke out which carried away thousands. The heathen were smitten with impotent terror. But Christians regarded the calamity as a call to work. They displayed true zeal and selfsacrifice. Obedient to the teachings and examples of their holy Religion, they not only contributed liberally of their means to feed the famishing—but numbers of them attended the sick, night and day. Those who could not give money, endeavored to do the more service to the suffering. Not deterred by seeing their brethren fall victims to the contagion, they hastened to supply the thinned ranks, joyful that they were thought worthy to die in so merciful a cause. Such was their zeal and liberality, on

occasions like this that Tertullian could say, in his apology —"If we give nothing to your gods, we do give for your poor, and our charity spreads more alms on your streets, than the offerings presented by your religion in your temples."

It early became a custom among Christians to appropriate the first-fruits, or tithes of their harvests to the support of religion, and especially of the poor. Besides this, offerings were brought by communicants to the Lord's supper, and at the anniversaries of the funerals of relatives, for the same benevolent purpose. On certain occasions general collections were taken for the relief of the indigent; fasts, also, were turned to account in this way (as indeed was the case under the Old Testament among the Jews). All the sermons preached on fast-days during the latter part of the third, and fourth centuries, are mainly charity sermons. They made it a duty to lay by for the nourishment of their poor brethren, whilst they abstained from food themselves. During a famine in Caesarea, St. Basil so moved the rich by his eloquent appeals, that they opened their granaries to him, and he fed multitudes daily with bread and other provisions. Chrysostom says of Olympias, the widow of Pammachius, prefect of Constantinople: "From thy earliest youth thou hast not ceased to nourish Jesus Christ, to quench his thirst, to visit him in his afflictions, and in our days, the ocean of thy charity has spread to the ends of the earth." St. Gregory declares that his mother, Nonna, would have exhausted a sea by her largesses. Gorgonia, her daughter, not content with enriching the churches, received at her house all the pious, was the friend of widows, and extended to the unhappy an assisting hand. Her house was a hospital for all her neighbors in destitution, and her goods were the common patrimony of the poor. Do such instances fill us with admiration? Then what shall we say of those, who, after having sold and distributed all their possessions, crowned their self-sacrificing zeal *by selling themselves into servitude, that they might give the proceeds to the poor!*

But in order to meet the wants of the needy and suffering more fully, public hospitals and almshouses were founded at an early period. Among the first advocates and founders of such charitable institutions, we find Ephraim the Syrian, Basil, and Chrysostom. Basil opened a hospital for lepers, at the gates of Caesarea, in 370. About 375, a fearful famine broke out in Edessa, and, as usual, was followed by a fatal plague. Ephraim, learning that a crowd of wretched persons, without bread and shelter, were lying in the public square, quit his hermitage, came to Edessa, and so warmly appealed to the rich of the city, that they at once furnished him with money enough to set up three hundred beds in the public galleries for the accommodation of the sufferers. Similar houses were soon established by Christians in most of the cities. In the reign of Constantine, St. Zoticus founded a Lobotrophium in Constantinople, to succor the maimed and impotent. Chrysostom, with the sums economized in the expenses of his bishopric, enriched or founded many such in the same city, and employed clergymen and physicians to serve in them. His example was followed by many others. The illustrious widow, Fabiola, after founding a hospital at Rome, begged to be appointed the first nurse. Often she carried the sufferers upon her arms, and washed wounds from which others would have revolted. The Empress Flacilla went herself to the hospital, took care of the sick, prepared their food, tasted their broths, and waited upon them in all the duties of a servant. "Let the Emperor," she said, "give his gold, but I wish in person to serve Him who holds the Empire."

Is this detail of testimony tedious and wearisome? Does it bring the blush of shame to our faces, for ourselves, and for the enlightened and elevated Christianity of the 19th century? Then we will forbear. But whilst others so often appeal to the early ages of the Church for proofs of abstruse questions of doctrine, rites or polity,—we prefer looking at the lovely charities which adorned their holy profession, and drawing from them arguments to incite

Christians to an imitation of their virtues. We care comparatively little whether they were Patriarchs or Popes, Metropolitans or Archbishops, Bishops or Presbyters, Priests or Pastors, who did these things. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father," does not sympathize half so much with dignities and doctrinal disputes, as with the widow and the orphan in their affliction, and all forms of human sorrow. Assuredly we will all admit that such deeds of beneficence as have just been quoted, more satisfactorily prove the divine source of Christianity —of its affinity to Him, who was anointed to relieve the wretched,—than any glittering mitre, or high sounding names.

We shall not stop here to inquire into the internal or external relation which may have existed between these remarkable displays of charity, and the ecclesiastical polity and dominant doctrinal theories of those early ages. Those beautiful phenomena may have been the natural products of the peculiar beliefs and church constitution of those days, or may have manifested themselves in spite of those peculiarities. If the former was the case, it may merely prove that the extreme sacerdotal or hierarchial tendencies then beginning to develop themselves, possessed a special adaptation to the wants and circumstances of that early period; not that such tendencies and principles are scriptural, or the best for all times. If the latter was the case, it demonstrates that where there is a heart for it, charity can surmount any barriers of extreme ecclesiasticism, or break through any incrustations of hierarchial forms. The active humanitarian beneficence of more modern Quakers, certainly proves that "*churchliness*" and *charity* are not essentially inseparable. Whereas, on the other hand, the persecuting spirit manifested in subsequent ages, when hierarchial ecclesiasticism had developed into stern and firmly knit maturity, serves to demonstrate that pitiless cruelties are not utterly incompatible with at least the formal exercise of pitiful charities. The same hand that, with paternal tenderness gave bread to one child, with revolting

cruelty gave a stone to another. The father that gave one son a fish, gave another a serpent. The mother that gave one daughter an egg, gave another a scorpion. Facts should not be forgotten in the discussion of principles. The Church that was at one time most energetic in founding asylums of comfort, also reared inquisitions of torture.

Thus far we have been arguing the subject before us upon the authority of explicit Scriptural injunctions, and the evidence corroborative of the duty of Christian charity furnished by the early ages of the Church. But if the Bible contained no plain and direct precepts upon this subject, if the New Testament failed to report any illustrious exemplifications of this great duty, and if we had no records or reliable traditions of the labors of love by which the life of the Church, during the first period of its history was so beautifully adorned; sufficient arguments in favor of such active charities would still not be wanting. For then we might confidently fall back upon the animating spirit of our divine Religion, and appeal to the tender sympathies which it ever begets in the hearts of true believers. In those hearts native selfishness, acrid and sour towards all who do not contribute to its gratification and aggrandizement, is not only neutralized, as by some alkali thrown into it, but is positively sweetened by the transforming salt of grace. As new creatures in Christ Jesus, the love of Christ is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost. And that love reaches out its arms of compassion, like those of the Redeemer stretched from East to West on the cross, to embrace the world, and draw humanity to its heart. The circumcised ear will then no longer be deaf to the cry of wo; the heart made flesh will no longer be cold and insensate as stone to the entreaties of grief. As a spirit of genuine piety, the spirit of Christ in them will make them too, very pitiful, and as a spirit of true sympathy, it will put them in such sympathetic "rapport" with all proper objects of compassion, as will really avail for their relief.

Love and pity like this require no formal injunctions to

beneficence, any more than fire need be told to give warmth, or the bright blaze of a burning lamp commanded to illumine the house. The spirit prompting them is in such living union with the fountain of all law, that, in its measure, it becomes a law unto itself. There was no specific precept requiring the good Samaritan to stop and minister to the wounded stranger in the wilderness. Full well did the priest and Levite know this; else, for sheer external righteousness' sake, they had sought to render some sort of compliance. But the Samaritan's inner life moved in the sphere of that higher law which, whilst ever in full harmony with written commands, is more comprehensive and potent than they are in their letter. In that sphere he recognized the claims of a universal brotherhood, resting on the broad basis of a common paternity in God. In that sphere he understood what was "the chief end of man," as encompassed by manifold and tender social relationships, and that God was most truly glorified, when temporal opportunities and means are employed, with proper motives, in deeds of mercy to His children.

But if the Samaritan knew and felt this, how much more should the Jew? And if the Jew, how much more men who enjoy the clearer light and occupy the loftier position of Christians? They, most assuredly, should not do works of piety, simply because "Thou shalt" goads them on to obedience, but because, as branches of the true vine, a divine impulse sweetly constrains them to yield such refreshing fruits. The smitten rock in the desert did not swallow back the sweet waters which sprang from its opened heart, but let them gush forth and run down, a vivifying stream, at which the panting parent, and his dying child might lave their consuming thirst and live. So will the heart, whose latent affections have been imprisoned within itself by the selfishness of sin and which had become an almost impassible petrifaction, when touched by the hand of divine love in Christ, beat and throb with love for others, and give utterance to that love in such comforting words and beneficent acts, that many a one perishing

by the way, shall rise up and call the benefactor blessed. In a word, all who are truly created anew in Christ Jesus, and yield themselves up to the "power of that endless life" thus begotten in them, will be charitable, in the widest and most active sense of that term, because "the love of Christ constraineth them."

But this general influence of the indwelling law of love *acquires specific force from the comprehensive character of Salvation by Christ, as including the redemption of the* BODY *as well as of the soul, from the dominion and damnation of sin.* Christianity reconciles the antagonism of flesh and spirit, by so purifying the former as to render it a fit tabernacle for the latter. The Gospel, therefore, nowhere encourages or justifies a spiritualistic contempt of the body. The body is essential to the completeness of humanity. It was honored with the inhabitation of the Word made flesh, and, in a glorified form, continues to be the local centre of his exalted majesty. Whatever degradation it may suffer, through whatever corruption it may have to pass in the grave, a glorious ultimate destiny awaits it, in the persons of all the saints. It is not in the power of the sepulchre to destroy its true identity. Those carnal properties which are merely accidental to its present mode of existence, will of course moulder and pass away. But all the essentials of a corporeal humanity will escape the contamination and destruction of the grave. As the body was the outward organ through which sin entered into the life of man (the soul, which pervades both his physical and spiritual life, and is the bond of unity between both),— and thus became subject, with the spirit, to the law of sin and death; it is represented as a proper object of redemption also, and will share in the final triumph of redemption over sin and death in their last forms.

Whoever, therefore, is seized and pervaded by the true spirit of Christianity, will share this elevating view of man's corporeal life, and find his soul stirred with deep sympathy for the human body, when groaning under diversified forms of suffering. He will care for the body for

its own sake, if we may yield for an instant to so dualistic an expression, and not merely, for the sake of its temporary spiritual inhabitant. For its own sake will he keep it under, nor suffer any single member to exercise tyrannical authority over the whole. His body by its outward acts and service, as well as his spirit by its thoughts and emotions, shall be glorified in gloryfying God. And so when that body, either in his own person or in the person of another, is bowed down under the burden of some fierce disease, or is suffering from hunger or other destitution, he will feel prompted to relieve it to the extent of his ability. Just as he would instruct or admonish a man ignorant of divine truth, in the way of salvation, that so he may be instrumental in elevating that *man's* spiritual nature to the life that is in Christ, so he will feed, or clothe, or otherwise minister to a man whose *body* may be pining under some sad entailments of sin, so that his bodily nature may be more and more rescued from the sufferings it may endure and be fitted for the higher life it is destined to share with the spirit. Such a prompting to beneficent charity, possesses unspeakably more value than all the superficial incentives of a sickly sentimentality.

In the divine potency of this law of love as an essential element in the moral nature of the Christian, and in this exalted Gospel view of the significance of the body, it is, therefore, that we find the secret and unfailing source of the efficient charitableness of the apostolic and immediately subsequent age of the Church. The earliest disciples of our Lord did not go forth on errands of mercy because a specific injunction directed them to perform acts of charity under prescribed circumstances. No formal code of casuistry was first consulted by them, before they engaged in any particular service of love and kindness to those who needed succor.

They carried in their pockets no draft of minutely worded rules of conduct, to guide them cautiously through each day's toils. And we need only consult some such testimony of their untiring and self-sacrificing beneficence, as is

furnished by the exceedingly interesting volume mentioned at the head of the present article, to learn, how much more efficiently that inner law of their new being in Christ, made them work, than they would have been able to do under the goading force of some outward rules. And it may fairly be questioned, whether any apparently happy results, brought about by substituting such external machinery, for the influence of the indwelling spirit, or by bringing such machinery to bear in cases where the spirit is apathetic, or utterly wanting, are not secured at too great a cost. Rather by far let Christians, as the Church, cherish that tenderness, that pitifulness, that charity, which Christ within them seeks more and more to inflame in their hearts, and outward rules of beneficence will become superfluous. Let them become none the less orthodox, but more benevolent, none the less Churchly, but more Christ-like, and then the worthy poor will not be allowed to knock at the door of the State for food, and the suffering sick will not pine away unpitied or uncared for, on pallets of straw in hovels of mud.

After the martyrdom of the first Bishop Sixtus of Rome, Laurentius, his deacon, assembled all the poor that he could find in Rome, and distributed to them his treasures, without sparing even the sacred vases of his church. The prefect of Rome, informed of the liberality of the deacon, and supposing that Christians had more wealth in reserve, ordered the deacon to deliver them to him. Laurentius asked three days time to meet the demand. At the end of this term he called forth the prefect, and showed him, drawn up before his church, in long and regular array, the blind, the lame, the maimed, and the wretched of all kinds, people whom he nourished, and said—"Behold my treasures."—And why, if we are regenerated in the same Christ Jesus, if we follow the same leader, if we profess the same pure and undefiled religion, why should not these be the treasures of the Church now? It is our rejoicing that Christ is the same to-day, yesterday, and forever. Ought not his people, therefore, to exhibit, in all ages, correspond-

ing traits of character? It is well said by St. Bernard of Clairvaux:—"In this does Christian faith manifest itself, that he, who lives by it, no more lives unto himself, but to Him who came to save all. And let no one say here: I will live unto Him, but not for my neighbor. For Christ not only lived for all, but died for all. How then can he live for Christ, who is unwilling to care for those whom Christ loved? How can he live for Christ who does not obey his law and follow his precepts? Wilt thou know the law? He tells us what it is: 'This is my commandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you.' And his Apostle adds: 'Bear ye one anothers' burden.'"§

Would that the Church, in her entire ministry and membership, might realize more deeply than ever, and proclaim it with more intense earnestness, that not frames and feelings, are the best evidence of genuine piety, and of a living union with Christ the head, but active "faith, that worketh by love;" that although good works, without cordial charity, are but as sounding brass, and a tinkling symbol, there is no charity at all, not even in the mere sound, where there are no good works, or powerful promptings to them. Let the Church feel herself urged, therefore, more pressingly than ever, to "love not in word, nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth." Such beneficent "love is the fulfilling of the law," and the best demonstration to the world, that she is the chosen Bride of the Lamb.

The inquiry now naturally arises, how and by what methods, may the great duty we have had under consideration, be most effectually carried out; and what beneficial results to the Church itself, and all who might individually participate in the good work, flow from the faithful discharge of this duty? But we must reserve these points for another time.

J. H. A. B.

§ "Geistliche Stimmen aus dem Mittelalter." p. 182.

ART. IV.—THE FESTIVAL OF ADONIS.

For setting forth some of the peculiarities of his own countrywomen, a fine opportunity is afforded Theocritus, in the dialogue, which he gives us in his fifteenth idyl, between two of these women who have been residing sometime in Alexandria in Egypt and who are now drawn abroad into the streets to see something of the celebration, which is going on, of the great festival of Adonis. As the poet had sojourned in this city several years himself he had, no doubt, at the annual return, in the spring, of this feast, often been struck with the picturesque effect of the contrasted manners and showy dress of the people brought together on such occasions from different parts, and especially, of course, had his observant eye and quick ear been caught by, and taken with, the unobtrusive style and blunt bearing and free address of those from his own island; whose nationalities, though at home he might almost have overlooked them, yet now, when placed abroad among others, he saw presented before him in all their native simplicity and quaintness. Of this idyl too, by the way, the scene being laid in Alexandria affords him an excellent opportunity of throwing off incidentally some well-timed compliments to Ptolemaeus Philadelphus, the great king of Egypt, and his queen Arsinoe, for both of whom he seems to have entertained a very high regard.

The worship of Adonis, as we all know, belonged not at first to Grecian mythology. It had been brought over into it from Asia, and more especially from Phoenicia. Of course with the eastern people it had its mythical sense. Under the form of this beautiful shepherd they wished to humanize and represent, so that their senses and affections could the more easily take hold of it, the vital principle of vegetation; which, on the approach of winter, sinks deep down into the earth, but on the return of spring it is restor-

ed again to its former life and beauty. As the ancient Grecians had a myth of their own of somewhat similar import, the going down to the nether world of Persepone in the winter, and her glad return to earth in the spring, we might have supposed they would hardly have cared to receive into their mythology any foreign representation of the same natural events. As, however, the ceremonies of the worship of these two divinities, though both conducted by women, were nevertheless very dissimilar in their representations, those belonging to that of Persepone and her mother being very solemn, majestic and mysterious, but those to that of Adonis more outward, showy and spirited, and as the former were generally celebrated in the autumn and the latter in the spring, they could not certainly have encroached, to any extent, upon the rights of each other. As the Greeks were ever free to appropriate to their own use any worthy deities they might wish from abroad, it is not to be wondered at then that, to suit the tastes of all, they had long ago received into their mythology this interesting Asiatic youth, and instituted in many of their cities the appropriate festival to his honor. As the ancient Sicilians, however, in their blooming fields of Enna on the side of Mount Aetna, possessed the very spot where, according to the common story, Persepone had been seized upon, and carried off, by Aedoneus, and as they had a warm partiality for every thing that belonged to their own island, it might be inferred that they at least must have preferred her worship to that of any other. But while for her they entertained the highest regard and reverence, their women generally swearing in her name, and the initiated always observing with becoming celebrations, in Syracuse, the festivals in honor of herself and mother, still, it must be owned that, being a vivacious people and fond of life and incident, in spite of all their national partialities, they could not help being pleased with the pastoral and romantic love affair between Adonis and Aphrodite; and though his festival had never to any extent been introduced into their cities, yet the shepherds loved to hear

about him, and by their bucolic poets no other ancient hero was ever more fondly celebrated. No wonder then that in the present case, these two women from Syracuse, residing now in Alexandria, seem to feel no compunctions of conscience whatever on the occasion, but enter with all earnestness and wonder into the full enjoyment of the great celebration.

The scene opens on the second day of the festival. All the sorrow and mourning, which on the previous day had held the city on account of the death of Adonis, has passed away, and from the early morn has nothing been heard or seen but jubilant manifestations and splendid exhibitions of rejoicing on account of his happy resurrection. The women to whom we are introduced, we must admit, belong not just to the highest class of ladies to be met with either in Alexandria or Syracuse; but still they are very respectable. On going out they are accompanied each with a female slave, and one of them leaves at home a nurse and, no doubt, other domestics. This, however, we must own, speaks not very much for their high gentility. A lady of rank and fashion, going abroad on such a gala day, would have taken with her at least half a dozen of servants. All that it shews is that they belong, at any rate, to the middling class in society. What strikes us at first in their conversation is that spirit of freedom and impatience of control which have ever characterized the manners of all Sicilians. Though, no doubt, good and affectionate wives at home, they express themselves very freely about their husbands when with each other apart, and they shew that they will not bear any thing even from them that looks like domineering. For any little act of attention paid them on the way by strangers they return the warmest thanks and good wishes, but for any insulting remark thrown out by the same, they know just as well how to give back the fitting retort. With all these and other peculiarities of theirs, however, there runs throughout their remarks such a vein of genuine human nature that we can not help being interested in them, and we are made to

think all the while that we have certainly met somewhere with just some such persons in our own day; entirely forgetting in our concern for them that the revived conversation to which we are attending must have actually taken place at least some two and a half centuries before the Christian era. What restores us to our senses, however, are the remarks let fall by them concerning their dresses. From these we are made to feel at once that we have been transported far back into a remote clime and are moving among primeval modes and fashions. Of the style of their attire we are struck with the extreme simplicity as compared with that of the ladies of our own day of whatever class or country. Their whole costume seems actually to be made up of little more than three important pieces! These too seem to have come out almost finished from the loom without their having undergone afterwards any very material changes beneath those transforming instruments so essential to a modern dress-maker, the scissors and needle. Praxinoe, when she washes herself, is already clad in her very delicate vesture without sleeves, fitting perfectly close to her person and limbs almost down to the knee, over which all she has to do is to put on her more important woolen garment or *chiton*; which, according to the Doric fashion, on the right side is closed, but on the left is to be kept together only by a few clasps. This is also sleevless and she fastens it on each shoulder by a brooch, where it has not been cut short, but it turns outward over upon itself behind and before, falling down thus into two lappets, which descend so low as to conceal the girdle which she has placed around it underneath. Over this she throws, around her arms and shoulders, her long, but not very broad, shawl-shaped *himation*, or, as we have rendered it, mantle, and then taking her parasol she is fully drest out for a walk. With all this simplicity, however, we are pleased to discover in these ladies some proper feminine feelings of vanity. Praxinoe lets it out that she is not altogether unacquainted with the use of pigments to heighten her complexion, and though she tries to seem

indifferent about the matter, yet we can easily see that she knows very well that she has just put on herself a remarkably fine and neatly fitting *chiton*. To say nothing of the wear and tear which, in the weaving, it had stood her constitution, it had cost her purse besides more than two minae of pure silver, which in our currency is little less than thirty dollars. We would hardly know how to account for this extravagant outlay on a woolen fabric of her own making, even of the finest texture and quality, did we not bear it in mind that it had running through it some golden threads, no doubt, and, up the sides and around the borders, it must have been adorned with several choice and brilliant hues; some of which, as, for instance, that derived from the purple fish, were very expensive. Indeed with this simple costume of her own times, Praxinoe had, we think, the best right to be well pleased, as it was certainly very graceful and picturesque, and, with all our advancement in the arts, far better suited, we are constrained to allow, than any modern dress, even of the latest fashion, for setting off to the best advantage the well proportioned female figure.

THE PIOUS WIVES OF SYRACUSE:

OR

THE WORSHIPPERS OF ADONIS.

GORGAS.

Is Praxinoe within?

PRAXINOE.

Gorgas dear, how long! Within? Yes.
I wonder you came even now. See for a chair, Eunoè,
And put a cushion on it.

GORGAS.

Oh 'tis very well.

PRAXINOE.

Be seated.

GORGAS.

What a stout heart have I! Really alive I scarce have reached you,
Praxinoe, through such a crowd, so many four-horse chariots!
Every where soldiers tramping, every where cloaked horsemen riding!

And what a weary way! You live from us so very far off.

PRAXINOE.

Yes, He, the foolish, coming hither, purchased at the world's end [bors
This den—It is no house—that we forsooth might not be neigh-
To each other; all out of spite. The envious wretch? Just
GORGAS. [like him.
Of Dinon, your good man, my dear, do not be speaking this wise,
Before your little boy. Observe how very close he marks you.

PRAXINOE.

Cheer up, Zoperion, sweet boy, I do not mean your papa.

GORGAS.

The child sees through it, on my word! Yours is a darling
PRAXINOE. [papa.
But yon papa—That naughty one of whom I was just speaking— [chase
That other papa, from the booth some soap and rouge to pur-
Going, brought me instead some salt. The worthless, careless
GORGAS. [fellow!
Just like my Diocleides. He knows not the worth of silver.
For five pieces of dog's wool he paid yesterday seven drachmas—
Pluckings it was of old maimed ewes, all trash, trouble on trouble!
But come, put on your woolen chiton and o'er it your mantle,
And let's go up to the grand hall of our king Tolemaeus
To see the Adonis; which, as I hear, has, in the richest fashion,
Been deckt out by the queen. With royal folks all things royal.

PRAXINOE.

Wait till we've seen, then knowing we can well describe to oth-
GORGAS. [ers.
Time we should go. Our feast of talk we'll leave till at our
PRAXINOE. [leisure.
Eunoe, help me wash. The ewer fill and place it near me.
Haste, languid creature! Cats are spoiled by over dainty faring.
Pr'ythee bestir thee, wench! Some water! first I wish some water.
This way she helps me wash. Pour out some then. Not so profusely! [sprinkled!
See now, you baggage! all my under-dress how you have

Enough. Well I am washed, be sure, as well as Fates would have me.
The key of my great chest, where is it! Quickly hand it to me.

GORGAS.

Praxinoe, how handsomely the folds of that clasped garment
Hang from your shoulders! Tell me from the loom how much [it cost you.

PRAXINOE.

Don't speak of it, Gorgas. More than two minae of pure silver;
And in its making my own life almost into the bargain.

GORGAS.

But sure it meets your highest wishes.

PRAXINOE. [ly.

Yes, you've told me tru-
My parasol and summer mantle. Throw it neatly round me.
My child, you must not come; the hobgoblins, the horse would bite you. [led.
Cry as you will; I do not wish to see you brought home mang-
Let us be off. Phrygy, take in Zoperion. Try to please him.
Call in the dog; and—Do you hear?—shut after you the door fast. [we manage
Good heavens, what a crowd! Which way, what manner shall
To push ourselves through it? Emmets unnumbered and unmeasured!
Many the noble deeds achieved by thee, O Tolemaeus,
Since thy great sire was made immortal! Now no evil-doer,
The unwary passer watching robs, after the style Egyptian.
Pranks of which sort, by men conjoined in foul deceit, were played off;
All on a par, a set of artful rogues—of arrant sharpers.
Oh, dearest Gorgas, what now shall we do? Here are the war steeds [me.
Of the king a coming! My good sir, pr'ythee do not tramp
That sorrel rears himself upright, oh, see how fierce! Foolhardy
Eunoe, flee why do you not? Oh, he will kill his leader!
How glad am I, my dearest boy, I made you stay within doors!

GORGAS.

Cheer up, Praxinoe, the danger's past. They are behind us,
And have come to order.

PRAXINOE.

Ah me! I feel somewhat collected.

A horse and a cold snake, of all things, have I ever dreaded
From my childhood. See, what a crowd is flowing towards us!

GORGAS.

Come you from the hall, good mother?

OLD WOMAN.

Yes, my children.

GORGAS.

To enter
Is it easy?

OLD WOMAN.

Into Troy by trying entered the Achaians.
My dear children, by trying are all things to be accomplished.

GORGAS.

The old dame has pronounced her oracles and then departed.

PRAXINOE.

Our sex know all things, even the hidden mysteries of Hera!

GORGAS.

Behold, Praxinoe, about the door what an assemblage!

PRAXINOE.

Unspeakable! Gorgas, give me your hand, and take, Eunoe,
You that of Eutychus. Hold on to her lest you be sundered.
We will go in all together. Stick close, Eunoe, to us.
Ah me, unlucky! Off from me already is my mantle
Wrested, Eunoe! Gentle sir, if under Zeus you would be
Happy ever, please have respect unto my summer mantle!

STRANGER.

It rests not on myself, but I'll respect it.

PRAXINOE.

What a dense crowd!
They shove like swine!

STRANGER. [a safe place.

Be cheered, good woman, we have reached

PRAXINOE.

For next year and for aye may you, kind sir, be in a safe place
For your good service. What a courteous and obliging stranger!
Hard is Eunoe beset too. Fail not, my girl; Press onward!
Well done. All in! as cries the groom when safe he shuts his
GORGAS. [bride in.

Praxinoe, proceed this way. Observe first this embroidery.
Fine and how beautiful! Of gods the weaving you would call it.

PRAXINOE.

Holy Athena! Who the women who could weave such texture!
And who the men who could so cunningly work out such pic-
So true to nature every form, to nature every gesture! [tures!
Not woven are these but alive! How wondrous man's inven-
tion!
Himself, lo, lying down—How to be gazed at!—on his silver
Footed pallet, the first young hair down falling from his tem-
Adonis thrice beloved, in Acheron still fondly cherished. [ples,

ANOTHER STRANGER.

Give o'er your vile, outlandish talk, ye wretched, ever prating
Turtles! To death will they drive us with their incessant
GORGAS. [drawling.
By mother Earth, whence comes this man! What is't to you
if we prate? [cusans?
When you possess us give commands. Command you Syra-
Know you not this too? We Corinthians are, by proud ex-
traction;
As was likewise Bellerophon. We speak the Pel'ponnesian—
To speak their Doric cannot be denied, we think, to Dorians.

PRAXINOE.

Let no man rise, O Cora sweet! to own us for his subjects
But one. You, sir, I do not care for. You can never stint me.

GORGAS.

Silence, Praxinoe; about to celebrate Adonis
Is now the maiden from Argeia, the most skilful singer,
Who 'twas that bore the palm away by her lament on Sperchis.
Expect you something fine. Now she collects herself for action.

THE FEMALE SINGER.

O mistress mine, who Golgi and Idalium lov'st to visit,
And Eryx placed on high, mirth-loving golden Aphrodite,
Such the Adonis which for thee from everflowing Ach'ron,
A twelve-month having fled, have brought the easy-footed
Horae—
Horae, the friendly, slowest of the blest; but ever longed for,
They come at last to mortals all, forever something bearing.
Thou Cypris, of Dioné born, immortal from a mortal,
As is the current speech of men, didst fashion Berenice,
Ambrosia, the food divine, through all her breast diffusing.
Thee favoring, O many-named, worshipped in many temples,
Her daughter—long may she remain!—fair as the far-famed
Arsinoé, with many gifts adorns for thee Adonis. [Helen,

Here nuts and fruits, all kinds, are placed from choicest trees far gathered, [kets
And tender greeneries set around, well guarded in their bas-
Of silver work, and Syrian unguents kept in golden vases.
Here all the kinds of cakes are strewed which women, skilled in pastry, [mingling;
Know how to make, the whitest flour with herbs and spices
Some mellowed through with honey sweet, and some enriched with fresh oil. [bear them.
They lie all sorts of things shaped like, on feet or wings that
Here green pavilions covered o'er with heavy breathing anise
Constructed are, and winged boys, the Loves, above are flying;
Resembling new-fledged nightingales, when perched upon the tree-tops, [venture.
From bough to bough, with timid wings to flit across they
O wealth of ebony, O gold, O eagles twain, well fashioned
From ivory, bearing to Zeus the boy to be wine-bearer!
A woolen woof all purpled through, softer than sleep its texture,
As a Milesian would say, as would a Samian shepherd,
That couch o'erspreads on which reclines Adonis in his beauty.
This one does Cypris hold, that one the rosy-armed Adonis,
Of summers eighteen, or nineteen at most, the golden bride-groom. [ing.
His kiss hurts not, the callow down of youth his lip still wear-
O Cypris, now be happy thou, thou hast again thy husband.
The morrow morn, while hangs the dew, will we, once more collected, [ing;
Bear him to where upon the beach the gentle waves are break-
And we will let our hair fall loose, our folds down to our ankles;
And we will bear our breasts and beat and sing his mournful farewell. [ron,
Thou goest down, Adonis dear, thence ev'n to gloomy Ach'-
A demigod the rarest thou. Not such did Agamemnon
Fate undergo, not Ajax great, the very wrathful hero,
Not Hector whom of twenty sons Hecuba bore the eldest,
Nor Patrocles nor Pyrrhus home from Troy renowned returning;
Nor earlier those, the Lapithae, and children of Deucalion,
Nor Pelops' sons nor Argos' pride, the valorous Pelasgi [us;
Smile on us now, Adonis blest, and may'st thou next year glad

Both when thou goest and when thou com'st, Adonis ever
GORGAS. [friendly.
Praxinoe, this woman, as a singer, is superior.
What fine things does she know!
PRAXINOE. [sweet voice.
Yes, superfine. She has a
GORGAS.
But homeward must we go. No dinner has had Diocleides;
Who, always sour, is not to be approached when he is hungry.
Farewell, Adonis dear. Come ever thou to those well faring!

We do not wish to become too grave or speculative at the close, but we cannot well dismiss the subject without remarking that, by the celebration of this festival, something more, certainly was intended than a mere worshipping of nature. However regarded by the common people, by the fully initiated, at any rate, it was, no doubt, understood to show forth, under its human representation, something far above the mere bursting forth, from the fetters of winter, of things animated and inanimate, and their joyful bloom and vigor thereafter throughout the spring and summer months. By this general revival of nature, forming of it, as they did, themselves the most essential part, they could not help, of course, feeling exhilerated, but beneath it all likewise, no doubt, they descried the very palpable analogy. From these outward manifestations and their own inward feelings, they were surely induced to conclude that, at least for some favored members of the human family, even from the dominion of the grave, so much resembling that of winter, it was not at all impossible, through some divine interposition, to be delivered and restored again to their former life and beauty. How pleasant it is to observe, even in the heathen world, these earnest reachings after the truth, however mistaken, so long before its full and final revelation! In the time of its observance the festival of Adonis corresponds very nearly with that of our Easter, and during the first day it reminds us some little of its solemnities, while on the second, though partaking

more of the festivities of a marriage celebration, yet, in its rich display of good things, it calls up vividly before our visions something of that profusion of fruits and fancy cakes and decorated trees to be seen and enjoyed at Christmas. Not certainly as an idle mockery of the most sacred things belonging to our religion should this festival be regarded, but rather as being a most conclusive testimony, in the earliest ages, to the universal want of mankind, and a dim foreshadowing of the future coming of Him, who, in his own sacred person, was to reveal and satisfy the desire of all nations.

W. M. N.

ART. V.—THE AMERICAN STUDENT IN GERMANY.

The following article was prepared by a friend of the Congregational Church, a distinguished scholar of New England, who himself spent several years in Germany, and falls in admirably with the scope of this Review, as a discriminating tribute to German scholarship and literature, and as a strong plea, at the same time, in favor of the Theological Tutorship scheme now before the German Reformed Church. It was originally a review of Dr. Schaff's work on Germany, published a few years ago; but as the book is already known to most of our readers, we have left out the introductory pages which relate to it.—EDITORS.

The number of students who go to Germany from America every year is not inconsiderable, and it seems likely largely to increase. The impulse to go has for the last ten years gathered strength in a geometrical ratio, and is becoming almost a *furore*. Pastors leave their pulpits, professors their chairs, graduates rush from their Alma-Mater, undergraduates separate themselves from their college classes, that they may study in Germany, as though

in Germany alone were the keys of knowledge; and as though from the very atmosphere of that favored land, a man must inhale the inspiration both of scholarship and genius. This tendency is regarded by many with vague suspicion, by others with prejudiced dislike, by others with ignorant terror. By others it is fostered with active zeal and is urged forward with little discrimination, and without regard to the character, the previous training and the present knowledge of the student. 'Go to Germany,' is the advice given to all. 'Go if you can, go as soon as you can, and remain as long as you can, for you will be sure to be the better for it in all respects, as a theologian, preacher and man.'

It has been suggested to us, that the subject deserves a special discussion, and that, by the handling of it, useful hints may be offered and perhaps some important questions may be answered. If the subject is not widely interesting to the many, it is intensely interesting to the few,—to the student himself who is fired with determined enthusiasm, and self-confident ardor, and to the parents and friends who are deeply concerned for his welfare. So far as this tendency is likely to determine the type of theology and the style of scholarship which are to become current among us, it may be regarded as one of the most important movements of the age, as well as one of the most striking signs of the times. If the institutions of a country go far toward forming the principles and deciding the aims and tastes of the best part of its people, some influence will be certain to follow a residence at foreign universities, by no inconsiderable portion of its choice young men. These influences will not be confined to the sphere of Theology, but will be sure to be felt in the science and literature of the country. We propose to discuss them in their general bearing, as well as in relation to the individuals concerned.

The points which present themselves for our consideration, are the reasons for and against studying abroad; the best time for doing this; and the methods of study and employment which promise the best results.

Why should the student desire to study in Germany, and why should he not desire it?

The first and most obvious answer to the question is, that he may master the German language. It is one thing to study German and even to study it so as to acquire considerable facility in using it, and it is quite another to master it. The language itself is at once so copious and so refined, that, in order to use it with ease and with confidence, long-continued attention is required. Otherwise the medium through which we receive knowledge or follow out speculations, delays and embarrasses the mind. If the truths are recondite and the reasonings are subtle, the mind is easily clouded and fatigued. If the full force of the words be not received, if it is not quickly and sharply apprehended, the intellect labors and is offended. These difficulties have till of late been greatly aggravated by the circumstance, that many of the German Theologians and Philosophers have written in a negligent and dragging style—in a style so defective, that if it were English and not German, even English students would weary of toiling in the mire of its complicated and awkward phraseology. There is no way of learning a language so rapidly and so surely, as to hear it spoken by the people, at the same time that you are receiving fresh from the lips of living instructors the peculiar phraseology and the technical distinctions of the science of your choice. The language becomes less and less an embarrassment, and at last its presence is scarcely recognized. The medium of thought which was at first like a glass covered with mist, is cleared of all the obscuring moisture. You no longer see or think of the medium, but look directly upon the object. For some departments of science—and for the enjoyment of literature, a sufficient familiarity with German may be attained without hearing or using it as a spoken language. But if one desires to read extensively in theology and philosophy, it greatly facilitates the necessary preparation, to study the language among the people who use it, and to hear it employed by the scholars who think in it. This arises not

merely, perhaps not mainly, from the copiousness and intricacy of the language, but from its marked peculiarities, as an instrument and vehicle of thought. These peculiarities pervade the structure of the language. They gleam in every word, they are marked on every phrase, they are wrought into every sentence. To many a clear and sober Englishman who is introduced to them in mature life, they are utterly offensive. To the confiding and honest soul who casts his net in all waters, they are often excessively and painfully embarrassing. To not a few foolish youths, they are eminently attractive and captivating. These last suffer themselves to be imposed upon by mere phraseology, and take its personified and pictured abstractions to be the representatives of some ideas that have never dawned upon the English understanding and cannot be expressed in the English language. So far has this been carried, that a German sprite, if it be not rather a German devil, has taken possession of many books in philosophy, and even invaded our pulpits. Our English thinking and our English writing have seemed to be giving way before an invasion of terms and phrases as long and cumbrous as the Teutonic dressing gowns, and by no means as comfortable. German phraseology is paraded before the reader or hearer, as though it enshrined some distinction or truth which could not be conveyed in another dialect. The relief from this embarrassment, if it be an embarrassment, the cure for the affectation, if it be such, is to attain a more perfect mastery over this peculiar language, and to become more familiar with the German modes of thinking and expression. There is no way to do this so effectually and so rapidly as to be familiar with the language on its own soil, both as employed by the learned and as spoken by the people. Peculiar phraseology thus loses its power to embarrass or to mislead. The opinions and dogmas that assumed a false or factitious importance from their obscurity or their splendid pharaphernalia will be either rejected for their absurdity, or accepted for their manifested truth. The authors that gave a formidable sanction to scepticism

in philosophy or heresy in religion, no longer overawe by an obscure dread, when opinions and arguments are brought into the light of distinct statements and are subjected to clear-eyed scrutiny.

We have already said, that these special difficulties of which we speak are not experienced by the student of the physical sciences or of classical or sacred philology. Such students can indeed acquire the language with greater facility when they hear it spoken, but there is nothing except its copiousness and subtlety, which makes it imperative that they should study it in Germany. But to one, who would make himself familiar with its philosophy or theology, it is almost a necessity to do it on German soil and in German schools. The men, who are the most likely (other things being equal) to have their heads turned or *addled* by German speculation, are the men who do not study in Germany. We say other things being equal, for however salutary study at a German University may be to him who is capable of wisdom, we do not assert that it will make a foolish student wise, or a vain student modest, or a muddled intellect clear.

The second reason why a student should desire to study in Germany, is, that he may receive instruction from men of the greatest eminence in the several departments of knowledge. The Germans deserve to be considered as the teachers of the world. So far as knowledge and research are concerned, it may be safely and truly said, that they surpass all other nations. Whatever may be the department of knowledge, they are certain to have mastered and digested all that is known, and what is more to the purpose, all that has been written or thought in respect to it. Books are their field of labor, and research is the chosen and almost the only employment of their learned men. We can scarcely name a department of intellectual activity which living men have not occupied and endeavored to exhaust. In classical criticism, in general and comparative philology, in physics, astronomy, chemistry, mineralogy, geology, zoology, botany, geography—in history, civil and

ecclesiastical, in the history and criticism of literature, in the language and interpretation of the scriptures, in the history of theological opinions, in theology, psychology, logic and metaphysics, there are scores who have made the highest attainments of any men living, while there are hundreds of no mean acquisitions. If it be questioned whether all these acquisitions are in every case accompanied by that sound and discerning judgment which masters and uses its materials aright, it cannot be disputed that the knowledge is possessed and that it can be imparted to those who will and are prepared to receive it. The first principle of the German scholar is to master all that has been known and said upon a given subject by the writers and students of every country, every age, every language, and from this starting point to prosecute his own researches. *Gründlichkeit* is the single word which describes his aims and realizations. To exhaust a subject is his rule. It is of little consequence whether the subject is of near or of remote interest to his own country or to his own interests. He is not content till he has mastered all the literature of the subject, and re-digested and arranged it from his own point of view. Strange as it may seem, there are departments of English history and antiquities, of the criticism of the English language and literature, which have been more satisfactorily explored by German writers than by any Englishmen, living or dead. We are not so simple as to assert, that German authors are of course superior to every other, or that in single provinces of learning and thought they may not be surpassed. But we confidently declare, that there is scarcely any department of human knowledge in which it is safe to overlook them, and scarcely one in which they may not be consulted with advantage. So far as researches into what others have done or written, they are before all other nations. They furnish to the student the most complete and the best arranged encyclopædias, manuals, histories, digests,—in short everything which may be called the apparatus for thought.

But what shall we say of the use which they make of

their learning, and of the conclusions which they derive from their erudition? If they add to the stores of knowledge, do they not poison this erudition by the infection of absurd phantasms and dangerous heresies? Does not the immensity of their reading give a dangerous authority to the folly of their speculations? In some cases it does, but there are all sorts of German speculators, and it has been unfortunately the case, that those have made the most noise at a distance who were distinguished for extravagance and error. It must be confessed also, that the German scholars and thinkers are, as a body, not so conspicuous as the English, for sound judgment and clear-headed wisdom. They do not mingle in general society as do the English. Above all, the society in which they do mingle is not so free. They are cribbed and confined in the matters of social and public life, by senseless routine and oppressive absolutism. An infantine simplicity seems to grow up with them into mature life, attesting some defect of training. They have not the opportunity of gathering from childhood, by actual contact with free and daring spirits, that knowledge of man, which though unexpressed and inexpressible in language, grows into the firm and practical understanding of the English critic and thinker. The constant occupation of the mind with books from earliest childhood, narrows the sphere of the intellect, and while its view is widened so far as the opinions of others are concerned, it is narrowed in respect to its knowledge of men, and in the materials for reaching just conclusions. But while we make all these concessions in respect to the German thinkers as a class, the truth obliges us to add, that not a few are more comprehensive, more discriminating, more just and more sound in their conclusions, than the thinkers of any other nation. There are many, indeed, who sacrifice the honesty of conviction and the sacredness of conscience to the desire of making a sensation, and whose hatred of Christianity seems to us malignant and bitter even under the fairest show of candor, and the most erudite display of reading. But to object against the

Germans generally, that they are fools or heretics, is too foolish to be worthy the name of a heresy. It ought not to be thought strange, that where so many read and think in earnest, not a few should think unwisely. Then it should never be forgotten, that the Germans themselves begin to be ashamed of their own follies, and are fast outgrowing their own extravagances. Marvelous changes have taken place since the days of Hegel and of Strauss. Sobriety of judgment is fast taking the place of fantastic theorizing. The English common sense is rapidly coming into fashion.

One impression prevails in respect to the Germans, of which it is difficult to say whether it is more foolish or false, and that is, that they do not themselves understand the questions, about which they are employed; that in philosophy they strike off into aimless flights, they know not why nor whither, and in sacred criticism they are constantly inventing absurd hypotheses, to the starting of which there is not the least occasion or plausibility. Hence the inference is drawn that no instruction can be derived from those speculations which are erroneous, that it is wiser to let them alone altogether, or at most, that the study of them should be left to those unhappy mortals whose duty requires them to be conversant with morbid or offensive phenomena, who, by the necessities of their occupation, are obliged to explore all the dark and foul passages that wind through the cavern of error.

It would be easy to show the contrary. The speculative philosophy and theology of the Germans are not merely a brilliant, pestilent congregation of vapors. They were occasioned by the exhausting habit of the German inquirer, who, in the very act of subjecting to a critical review all the known theories of others upon his lofty theme, could not but present to himself for answer the loftiest and subtlest questions which can employ the human intellect. What if the intellect has now and then recoiled upon itself before the towering heights that were thus revealed to its gaze, or what if in the greatness of its own endeavor it has

sustained an unsteady flight? What if it has mistaken cloud-land for real land, in this bewildering atmosphere, to which the human vision is so unused? Does it follow that such efforts and such failures have wrought out no results to the human intellect, and that the study of them brings no instruction? To one who cares not to think, and who is not animated by the divine thirst for philosophical knowledge, such speculations may impart no wisdom; they may excite only disgust. But to one who is impelled to find reasons for his opinions, who must make his belief rational, that is well grounded, the study of such speculations, is at once the most inspiring and profitable. Nay, more; we may confidently assert, it is only out of unsound and too presumptuous speculation in philosophy and theology, that a sober, and yet scientific Christian philosophy and theology can ever be expected to proceed. The Socrates who taught such inspired common sense on these themes to the Athenian youth and through them to the world, must first needs try and train his intellect by the crude and fantastic speculations of the earlier Grecian schools.

The same is true of sacred philology. The historico-philosophical theories of the Tübingen school of critics, are not floating islands from cloud-land, which by the force of accident or caprice have settled over the early Christian records, but for all these theories there is some slender basis of fact. It is true that the fire from which comes all this smoke, is very feeble, and the portentous cloud into which it has expanded, seeming at times to shut quite down to the horizon, when once lifted by a fresh and healthy breeze, will be seen to be but an inverted pyramid, issuing from a single orifice, and attached to it by a single thread. The result of the contest will be a more complete vindication of the historic verity of these records, and a better understanding of their import. To realize these advantages, however, our scholars must understand the controversy and acquaint themselves with the writings on both sides. The issue cannot but be useful, both to the Science and the Faith of this generation.

It is, however, quite too late in the day to ask whether it were not wiser to leave German speculation alone. We cannot leave it alone if we will. If its influence is evil only, for that very reason must it be encountered and resisted. It has fascinated too many minds, and taken too strong possession of them to be ignorantly or superciliously disregarded. Besides, it is inwrought into all the departments of science and literature, and through them all it exerts an actual, though an insensible influence. We meet with it in the fiction, the poetry, the criticism, the interpretation, the physiology and the physics, not only of Germany, but also of England and America. If the philosophical and theological world leave alone German philosophy and theology, and endeavor to exclude them by remaining ignorant of the language in which they are taught, this philosophy and theology will make themselves heard through all these channels by the learned and the unlearned, and will infect by their conclusions the minds which they can not bewilder by reasoning, or overawe by pretension.

For all these evils the remedy must be sought from the same quarter whence originated the disease. The weapons with which we encounter these foes of a true science and a believing faith, are to be forged at and drawn from the same armory with theirs. To act effectively upon the mind which has been influenced by these speculations, one must have stood at his point of view, must have weighed the facts and have felt the arguments which have influenced him. Those theologians know not what they do, who shun a free and familiar acquaintance with every one of these forms of error. To be ignorant of them is to confess indolence and weakness. To advise others to disregard them, is to be blind to the character of the men and times in which we live, and to be untrue to the duties which those times and men impose upon us.

We scarcely need add, that all these advantages which the learning and activity of German scholarship present, can be more perfectly and rapidly secured by a personal residence in the country, than through the medium of

books. Books do indeed speak to those who are eager to hear, but they can not speak as do living men. Books can not impress the student as do the men who write the books; who in their own persons are laden with the learning and animated by the fire which their books can not fully represent nor perfectly impart.

Again, it is well for the student to reside in Germany, that he may gain the ideal of what solid learning is, and be conversant with living examples of patient and exhausting study. He will see for himself what a man can accomplish who devotes himself to study for his life, how he can train himself to toil and find in that toil a pleasure; how exhausting can be his labors, and how complete his success. Such an ideal can not but instruct the student, especially the student in his youth. It will set before him a high ideal of what study is, and of what can be accomplished by study. Even if his own vocation is not that of a scholar, it will do him good, in the busiest and most distracting hours of his professional or business life, to have known by personal observation how success in learning may be achieved, and what it is for a man to make a single department of effort the object of all his energies. He will learn to despise pretension and to reverence thoroughness, to look through the emptiness of verbiage, and the impositions of mere rhetoric, to reverence patient and self-relying research, and its fruits in solid acquisition. He will be freed from the notion so current among our students, that inspiration is the work of a moment, that insight may dispense with reading, and pronounce with infallible truth on subjects the details of which it has but imperfectly mastered. Most of all, will he learn to despise laziness and to reverence labor, to rid himself of an American dread of long continued application, as well to contract by several dimensions the inflation of his American self-conceit. For if the young student will but look about him he will find men of his own age, the extent of whose reading and the accuracy of whose knowledge will strike him with astonishment. Compared with theirs his own

It is, however, quite too late in the day to ask whether it were not wiser to leave German speculation alone. We cannot leave it alone if we will. If its influence is evil only, for that very reason must it be encountered and resisted. It has fascinated too many minds, and taken too strong possession of them to be ignorantly or superciliously disregarded. Besides, it is inwrought into all the departments of science and literature, and through them all it exerts an actual, though an insensible influence. We meet with it in the fiction, the poetry, the criticism, the interpretation, the physiology and the physics, not only of Germany, but also of England and America. If the philosophical and theological world leave alone German philosophy and theology, and endeavor to exclude them by remaining ignorant of the language in which they are taught, this philosophy and theology will make themselves heard through all these channels by the learned and the unlearned, and will infect by their conclusions the minds which they can not bewilder by reasoning, or overawe by pretension.

For all these evils the remedy must be sought from the same quarter whence originated the disease. The weapons with which we encounter these foes of a true science and a believing faith, are to be forged at and drawn from the same armory with theirs. To act effectively upon the mind which has been influenced by these speculations, one must have stood at his point of view, must have weighed the facts and have felt the arguments which have influenced him. Those theologians know not what they do, who shun a free and familiar acquaintance with every one of these forms of error. To be ignorant of them is to confess indolence and weakness. To advise others to disregard them, is to be blind to the character of the men and times in which we live, and to be untrue to the duties which those times and men impose upon us.

We scarcely need add, that all these advantages which the learning and activity of German scholarship present, can be more perfectly and rapidly secured by a personal residence in the country, than through the medium of

books. Books do indeed speak to those who are eager to hear, but they can not speak as do living men. Books can not impress the student as do the men who write the books; who in their own persons are laden with the learning and animated by the fire which their books can not fully represent nor perfectly impart.

Again, it is well for the student to reside in Germany, that he may gain the ideal of what solid learning is, and be conversant with living examples of patient and exhausting study. He will see for himself what a man can accomplish who devotes himself to study for his life, how he can train himself to toil and find in that toil a pleasure; how exhausting can be his labors, and how complete his success. Such an ideal can not but instruct the student, especially the student in his youth. It will set before him a high ideal of what study is, and of what can be accomplished by study. Even if his own vocation is not that of a scholar, it will do him good, in the busiest and most distracting hours of his professional or business life, to have known by personal observation how success in learning may be achieved, and what it is for a man to make a single department of effort the object of all his energies. He will learn to despise pretension and to reverence thoroughness, to look through the emptiness of verbiage, and the impositions of mere rhetoric, to reverence patient and self-relying research, and its fruits in solid acquisition. He will be freed from the notion so current among our students, that inspiration is the work of a moment, that insight may dispense with reading, and pronounce with infallible truth on subjects the details of which it has but imperfectly mastered. Most of all, will he learn to despise laziness and to reverence labor, to rid himself of an American dread of long continued application, as well to contract by several dimensions the inflation of his American self-conceit. For if the young student will but look about him he will find men of his own age, the extent of whose reading and the accuracy of whose knowledge will strike him with astonishment. Compared with theirs his own

attainments shrink into nothingness, and yet he can not despise their acquisitions as trifling or useless; nor does he find that this knowledge impedes the free action of the intellect or represses the freshness of the spirits. The men who have read the most, whether young or old, are not pedants, nor are they monks. On the other hand, their knowledge is more thoroughly incorporated into their being, and has become more entirely a part of themselves than are his own scantier attainments, while the freshness and energy with which they address themselves to fresh acquisitions, put him to shame.

Such examples of devoted and successful scholarship are most inspiring, especially to the young student. Indeed a man might well go to Germany, if he had no other object than simply to contract a genuine enthusiasm for study. For it is there, that this enthusiasm is excited to a passion, and animates an host of scholars with an intense and never-tiring energy. A well trained and diligent student from America, recently wrote home from Germany, "I never felt a genuine enthusiasm for study before." It penetrates the very atmosphere. It is kindled by the sight of and by daily contact with those learned men, who have devoted their thoughts and years to some great object of pursuit till it haunts them as with the force of a master-passion. It is excited by the ardent aspirations of the young devotee who with a splendid training and abundant erudition, is pressing on in the same career with single devotedness. To him the politics of the day, the panics of the money market, the beguiling fiction, the enfeebling newspaper, the superficial review and all the time-consuming occupations and excitements of every-day life are not permitted to interfere with his one object. And yet he is not a slave to his toil, but lives upon it and thrives by the fire of his own enthusiasm. He is not forever struggling between the impositions of task-work and the pleasures of relaxation, but having first of all adjusted his amusements to the duties and habits of a scholar, he prosecutes his pleasures and his work with so great energy, that it is some-

times hard to say whether he finds the most enjoyments in his work, or through heartiness puts the most work into his enjoyments. The scholar not only lives in a world of his own, but he is contented with that world and is satisfied with the superior satisfaction which it imparts. The bustling lieutenant may superciliously ring his sabre on the pavement as he passes, the ignorant noble may smile upon him contemptuously, the fawning trader may by vulgar and tawdry finery put the blush upon his simple and awkward attire, but he envies the lot of none of these, for he has adjusted his habits and his expectations to his condition in life, and is content to be only and wholly a scholar. In social intercourse he is simple, courteous and true. In his own house he is simple and economical, but hospitable and friendly. To be familiar with examples like these of genuine enthusiasm for knowledge and of the simple tastes which are becoming a scholar, can not but be salutary to the American student.

We venture to add in this connection, contrary to the usual impression, that a residence in Germany may furnish facilities for a high moral and religious culture. It is unquestionably true, that such a sojourn is attended with peculiar moral dangers. The most rigid observer of the forms of worship, who goes from America thither will be more offended than edified by the forms which the strict religionists of Germany observe and hallow. He may be attracted by the zeal of such, but he will be repelled by the strange importance which they attach to exploded dogmas. The more lax and liberal religionist will be in danger of being infected by the general indifference, so far as to be careless of all forms of devotion whatsoever. To reside in a foreign country tends of itself to disconnect a man from religious sympathy and communion, and deprives him of the incitements to fidelity which they furnish. On the other hand, it argues feebleness of religious faith and coldness in the affections, if a man does not seek out and find the best of excitements to both in the worship and life of German Christians. With them, it is true, there is ordi-

narily less pretension to piety than with us. There is less of religious talk for the sake of talking, and the theory of profession and action that underlies the religious life of the people is very unlike our own. But we should pity the bigotry and almost suspect the honesty of the man who, after having had access to the most truly religious circles of Germany, should not have found there examples of practical Christianity as sincere, symmetrical and graceful as any we can show at home. We should be outraged at that bigotry which would not be satisfied with many of the sermons which are preached from German pulpits, because forsooth the candles stood ready to be lighted at the crucifix, or which could not be moved by the unfeigned devotion of many earnest Christian assemblies, because of their disregard of certain important observances.

If the student can steer clear of the moral and religious dangers to which he may be exposed, dangers which are no more incident to the student than to the traveler, he may realize important religious advantages. It strengthens the faith and elevates the feelings to have to do with enlightened Christians whose creed and worship are unlike our own. It delivers the intellect from the miserable bondage of a narrowing and ignorant bigotry, to be conversant with the same faith held under differing creeds and to exchange the sympathies which are kindled by common doubts and difficulties, by similar hopes and fears, with those whose associations on other points are unlike our own.

But will not the student make shipwreck of his faith? May he not be entangled in the web of confident and imposing speculations, or bewildered by the glare of brilliant and imaginative theorizing? He may, and so he may if he remains at home. If his faith is not well grounded in intellectual conviction, or if with no preparation of positive and well supported belief he rushes upon the consideration of a multitude of negative theories, he may hesitate and falter. If, for example, with no examination of "the historic evidences" he envelops himself first of all with "his-

toric doubts," he may find himself in a labyrinth from whose mazes he cannot retreat. If he has had no really philosophical training, he may yield up his intellect and his Christian faith to the first brilliant lecturer who sets off the barrenness of pantheism with imposing phraseology and learned pretension. If the student has been trained, as too many of our own students are even under the most orthodox auspices, to receive assertion as argument if it is only sufficiently positive, and to believe that splendid declamation is the highest form of intellectual power, we need not wonder that when he meets with assertion that is more dogmatic and imposing than that to which he has been accustomed, only now in support of error, and is dazzled by a more glittering declamation that sets off falsehood, he should yield to their power. Especially is he in danger when there is superadded the subtle charm that seems to play with wizard power over the German language when it drops from the lips or the pen of genius. We have said a man may be exposed to these dangers if he remain at home. He may even encounter them here with greater hazard than if he studies in Germany. It is true now and then a young theologian returns from Germany with a confused intellect and an addled brain. Here and there one brings home the sad and sorrowful burden of honest doubts and a weakened faith. But the theologians who are infected with the tendency to Germanize in the worst sense of the term, are those whose German studies are prosecuted at second hand and perhaps with little knowledge of the language. We suspect that Mr. Emerson and Mr. Carlyle have had quite as much to do with this tendency as have Neander and Olshausen. But let a student of manly intellect and an honest faith go to Germany and hear for himself, and the charm if any with which error was invested at a distance will be likely to disappear on closer inspection. The heresy and falsehood which smelled like musk across the ocean, emits the rank odor of putrefaction as he draws near. The teachers of error and the teachers of truth are known when confronted

by the discerning spirit. The power to separate the truth from error is greatly enhanced, when the language is made familiar and unusual modes of thinking are mastered, when all adventitious appendages are dropped, and the truth and error which are to be received and rejected are translated into familiar conceptions.

We have not yet noticed the liberalizing influence which ought to be realized by every scholar who can study in a foreign university. If the sciences which he prosecutes and the instruction which he receives, do not differ in anything from those with which he is familiar at home, the mind is enlarged by receiving truth under new aspects and by being familiar with the working of intellects differently trained from his own. The youthful Milton went on a pilgrimage of study through Italy, till he was called home by the troubles of his time. In the earlier days of English learning, classical and theological, English students frequented the Continental universities, and there was a constant interchange of visits and letters between the learned of the island and the learned of the continent, to their mutual advantage. The best days for English thought, for English learning, and even for English literature, have invariably been the days in which England has had the most liberal intercourse with Continental scholars. This intercourse has at times been suspended and in some branches of knowledge almost for a century, in others perhaps longer. In others it has been maintained. It has been interrupted from various causes. Foreign wars, national prejudice, commercial superiority, protestant narrowness, (for there is protestant as well as papal exclusiveness,) high church bigotry, prelatic wealth and assumption, English hauteur, inexcusable laziness—each and all have had something to do with breaking up the old fraternal fellowship of thought. It is also worthy of notice that those branches of science and literature in which this intercourse has been most free, have flourished and made progress, while those in which it has not been sustained have dwindled and become contemptible. Had we time we might show how

much Germany has had to do with the renewed energy of the English mind during the present century. We could show that Scott, and Wordsworth, and Coleridge and Byron, were directly and powerfully influenced by German Poetry; that the higher criticism of England can be traced directly to the German critics—that Arnold was forward to confess his obligation to Niebuhr and Bunsen, that Grote would be as ready to acknowledge his own to his favorite authors, that Sir William Hamilton and the men of the neological school at Oxford would do the same, and that the classical philology of England has received a new impulse from the Teutonic schools. On the other hand we might show that those schools of thought, which have persisted in a terror-stricken non-intercourse with German thinkers, are fast becoming impotent and contemptible from their poverty of thought, or will soon shrivel into mummied relics by their own narrowness.

Science and literature in this country are preëminently in the first or forming stage. Such a period is exposed to great and peculiar dangers. It also has peculiar advantages. To none of these dangers and hazards do we desire to be blind, least of all to those to which we are exposed from undue influences from other countries. We would not be negligent of our advantages, if there be such in studying under the peculiar influences which residence at a foreign University may furnish. But the first of our three topics has perhaps occupied us too long.

We ask next, when shall the student go to Germany, or what period in the course of his studies should be selected as the proper time for studying abroad? The question is somewhat like, when shall a man marry? And it is to be answered nearly in the same language, viz., "when he is fully ready, and if he can."

But when is a man fully ready? What studies should first be finished and what begun? We answer, that depends upon the studies for which he is to be prepared. If a man asks us, when shall I go to Germany? we reply by first asking what are the general or special studies which

you propose to pursue, and how long do you propose to remain. For example, if the student desires to pursue mathematics or chemistry abroad, it is obvious that if he can stay in Germany long enough, he may if he please commence with the elements of these sciences and finish them there. No preparation is required except a sufficient knowledge of the language to understand the instruction given. He can even go into a laboratory and study with a very scanty acquaintance with German, if he has only some previous knowledge of the science. The subject matter in mathematics and in physics is not so much embodied in words, as furnished in material substances and in mathematical symbols. Concerning these there can be no ambiguity; they are not conveyed in vague and shadowy language. New discoveries are recorded in an unvarying and unambiguous terminology. Even then however there comes in another element to determine the decision, viz., the element of time. There may be little difficulty in entering upon such studies at any stage of one's advancement, and still if one has but six months or a year to spend abroad, and with eminent mathematicians or chemists, it is obvious that the later, and even the very latest portion of one's pupilage, should be selected, if the student would derive the highest advantage. Elementary instruction is more nearly the same all the world over. It is in the higher instruction that there is the greatest diversity, both in the knowledge to be conveyed and in the manner of imparting it. The same principles will apply to the study of history, with this exception only, that the higher researches in history supppose an immense command of detail which may as well or better be acquired at home. In philology, whether classical or sacred, the same is true. One had better learn in America than in Germany to decline his Hebrew and his Greek, and to read these languages with grammatical accuracy, and readiness, for the simple reason, that if Germany is preëminent in anything it is in interpretation. When we think of theology, whether exegetical, biblical, dogmatical or historical, much more

when we name logic, ethics, psychology and metaphysics, there occur to us obvious reasons why the time should be delayed as long as possible, and why elementary studies should be first prosecuted in the most thorough manner at home.

This is only a very general way of answering this important question. But from the nature of the case, it can at best be very indefinitely answered. The considerations by which each individual can be aided in satisfying his own mind will naturally appear under the following head.

We proceed then to suggest the conditions or methods by which the student may hope to realize the highest advantages from studying abroad.

The first essential condition to the highest success, is to attain an entire mastery of the language. Many sadly neglect this prime duty. They reason that the language is to them only a medium of gaining the knowledge which they seek; and are content to suspend all farther effort upon the language, so soon as they can be tolerably certain and ready in understanding their instructors. They imagine that a perfect knowledge will come of itself, by an insensible progress, even if no attention be directly bestowed upon it. They are content to make themselves understood in speaking, and do not aspire after a grammatical and fluent utterance of their thoughts. Now if it were true that the instruction sought for could be perfectly apprehended with so very imperfect a familiarity with the language, such a language as the German ought to be studied for itself. To know such a language is itself an education. If the saying of Charles V. is just, that to learn a new language is to become endowed with a new sense, it is eminently true that a language like the German rewards most richly the student who conquers it. It is so copious, so delicately shaded, and yet so precise in the dividing lines that separate terms and expressions that seem to run into each other, so glowing with emotion, so picture-making and so plastic, that to follow but a portion of the wealth of thought and feeling that are stored in its

words and sentences, at once stimulates and enriches the English intellect. We shall not be thought to go mad in our appreciation of the language, to those who weigh our representation of its defects, when we insist that this thorough study thould be diligently prosecuted, independently of the use to which we hope to apply it. But we cannot separate the one from the other. The more perfectly a language is mastered, the more perfectly does it answer the end of a medium of thought. The more fully we enter into the import of its terms and are able to reproduce to our own minds the nicety and the fullness of its wondrous phraseology, the more perfectly qualified are we to receive from our teachers the communications which they seek to give. In some branches of knowledge, this familiar acquaintance with the medium is not a requisite to successful study. In others it is, and so emphatically, that through lack of it, there can be nothing which deserves to be called success. What is clear to the instructor may to the pupil be very obscure. What to the teacher is justly distinguished, and even finely and felicitously reasoned, may either be rejected by the learner as transcendental nonsense, or if received with ignorant servility, may turn him into a transcendental fool, through the dishonesty which it leads him to practice with his own common sense. Indeed, much of the ill-repute into which German authors have fallen among us, is owing to the inadequate knowledge of the language manifested by their translators and interpreters. Grammatical correctness and verbal accuracy are far from qualifying a person to do complete justice to the thoughts of a German thinker. The majority of the readers of German authors, and even of the hearers of German professors, go no farther than this knowledge, and hence they fail to realize much advantage to themselves, as well as to make their profiting appear to others.

The first duty which a student in Germany should take in hand, and the last which he should intermit, is the study of the language. He should study it, not as a grammarian,

in order that he may teach it, nor as a philologist, in order to delight himself and pose others with mechanical repetitions of its forms or references to its etymologies, but as a thinker, that he may comprehend its peculiarities as an instrument of thought, and that he may see how thought itself is affected by the nature of its own vehicle and instrument. Only in so doing, can he enter into the peculiarities of German thinking, for it is only as one possesses fully the German language, that he can comprehend the actings of the German mind, and can understand or do justice to the speculations of the Germans in the higher departments of thought. By so doing he will study language itself with a truly philosophical interest, and derive from it an elevated satisfaction. From each attentive act or painful effort that he makes to surmount the difficulties of the foreign tongue, will come the increased capacity to understand and to use the English language well. The light that flashes on the language that he slowly learns, will be continually reflected upon that mother tongue which he seems never to have been forced to study, and upon which therefore he has never thought.

We could wish, for these reasons, that American students, when in Germany, would study the German language with higher aims and more persevering efforts. We have been almost moved to pedagogical wrath, to see rich men's sons profess to study in Germany, and actually to hear lectures at a University, and yet systematically neglect the choicest opportunities that were spread around them to master the most valuable of modern tongues; or to see earnest students content themselves with what chance should pour into their ears, while they seconded these opportunities with no severe or systematic attention to the language itself. No more striking or humiliating combination of American narrowness, laziness and self-conceit, can easily be conceived, than is in this way yearly displayed before the eyes of the truly cultivated, in the conduct of graduates from American Colleges.

A second condition of success is to be alive to the evils

as well as to the advantages of the methods of instruction practiced at a German University. The general impression is that these methods of teaching and of learning, are the only ones which are worthy of a rational being. Superficial travelers, who have never studied at the American College from which they have issued, or at the German University on which they so confidently pronounce, tell the public of the enthusiasm with which the students listen, and of the enthusiasm which the professors excite, and confidently predict that the good time will come when instruction will be given among us in no other way. So also many lecturers, and writers not a few, professors and guardians, press at every point the desirableness that such institutions should rise up among ourselves. If we could but have one American University, they say, then would science and learning flourish. The student himself catches the impression. He longs to be delivered from his imposed task-work and to have command of his time and employments. He defers the great work of self-improvement till he can study at a foreign University, and follow out at his own will the studies to which his own genius or his future pursuits may direct him. When he reaches the University, he finds much to gratify and much to disappoint him. We will suppose him to have learned the language as he should, and to be ready to enjoy its advantages without embarrassment. What does he find to be true? First of all he discovers that the entire system is based upon and adjusted to the severe labor and the severe examinations of the gymnasia. These are assumed as the proper preparation, and it is supposed that to the gymnasial discipline the hearer has been in fact subjected. Accordingly, those sciences which have been passed over and deferred to the University, are taught by lectures in the most elementary way. Some are treated with the dryness of the dullest dictation. The Professor reads his book, and the lectures which will be his book in due time. Instead of reading his treatise after it is published, the students hear him read it before he prints it, and studiously write

out in their sheets, the principles and facts which they might as well read in their closets. If the Professor has stored from his reading great wealth of learning, if by his own reflection he has turned it to new uses, and developed from it important principles, if he exhibits his erudition and his thoughts with a felicitous method, or the force of an animated delivery, it is worth while to hear him. Often it may be worth a voyage across the Atlantic to hear him. But the majority of lectures and lecturers furnish no advantages above private reading, except those which belong to oral delivery. Under the best and most favorable supposition, such lecturers cannot supersede private and personal labor. If they do not excite and direct to it, the impressions from them are transient and the results are meagre. The Professors themselves are affable in the hour which they daily set apart for converse with the students, and overflow with unfeigned hospitality to those who are favored with an invitation to their reception evening. But they do not and cannot concern themselves with the private studies of their hearers, and to the great majority of them they must be entire strangers. If you gain access to them and ask what they think of the actual workings of the University system, they will tell you it disappoints them continually, that all the conscientious Professors are of the opinion that teaching by lectures only is most unsatisfactory in permanent results, and that there ought to be engrafted upon it the practice of frequent repetitions and the direction of private reading. But the system remains as it is, and the student from America finds himself under its influences for good or evil. He may derive from it the most important advantages. If he has the requisite preparation of discipline and knowledge—of which more hereafter—he may be excited by the genius and enlarged by the comprehension of the superior mind, which spreads out before him the inviting field which has been the world to itself for scores of years, or presents the results of its own researches upon a difficult question, casting light upon some dark corner of that field. He may be inspired with

new aims, and be excited to a thirst for knowledge which he has never known before, and under these impulses he may prosecute his private studies with a new created or renewed energy. But if he be excited by no such enthusiasm, and impelled by no such efforts, his University course will leave him slightly better, or materially worse than it found him. It may give him some new thoughts—a more comprehensive view of a science, or a field of history—it may start new questions in his mind, and enable him to converse upon novel themes and to refer to unfamiliar books and authors. So far he may be slightly better and wiser. But if it makes him more self-conceited and superficial, more dogmatical and supercilious, more sceptical and uncertain, it will be for the worse that he ever studied at a German University. The only way to derive present advantage, and to lay up valuable stores and permanent habits for future improvement, is to accompany such a course of lectures by assiduous private study and reading. To this there are many hindrances, some of which are unknown at home. The very number of exciting subjects, and the reputation and brilliancy of the lecturers, tempt the student to over-task his powers, and to consume his time in hearing only. The excitements from without in novel sights and sounds and in the distracting allurements that are never wanting in a foreign town, as well as the absence of immediate responsibility to any one but himself, are not easily appreciated by the student who has not tried them.

But our course of thought has led us to another theme. The student, to succeed, ought to be fully prepared by previous study, to start with those attainments in thought and acquisition which are required in order fully to appreciate and wisely to judge the instructions to which he listens. This rule is often violated, even by the German student. Perhaps no cause has been more potent than this in producing the disastrous effects of German speculation and theology. Brilliant and daring lecturers have been able to turn the heads of their hearers, because they have plung-

ed them at once into questions which their previous studies had not prepared them to meet, and have carried them away by the force of fervid eloquence, of imposing learning and dazzling imagery. We have only to imagine a German student fresh from the gymnasium, listening to Hegel's exposition of logic, or to Strauss's vindication of the mythical theory, or to Baur on the canon. He is a well trained classical student, and a tolerable Hebraist, and has studied a brief system of formal logic or psychology, and he plunges at once into questions the very statement of which require special reading and practiced familiarity with abstract terminology and philosophic thinking. But it is doubly unlucky for the American who encounters questions of which he has never dreamed, and hears topics discussed to which he has never been fairly introduced by the course of his previous studies. How absurd and how unnatural to attempt a course on the history of philosophy, which supposes the hearer to know what Philosophy is, and what it attempts to perform, or on logic, or on metaphysics, without some previous familiarity with the topics and questions involved; or to encounter one of the giants in philological criticism, without having mastered the alphabet of the subtle art; or to grapple with the latest speculations of the Tübingen school, without having gone over the historical and exegetical reading which are required to appreciate even its power to destroy; or to enter upon a course of prelections in dogmatic theology, with the elements of which the lecturer supposes his pupils to be already somewhat familiar. It is doubly or trebly unfortunate for the American student to be thus deficient, for he must encounter his embarrassments through a foreign language, marked by striking peculiarities and reflecting the genius of a people unlike his own. It is not surprising that not a few disappoint themselves and their friends, and bring away no more substantial results in Philosophy and Theology. They were not prepared to appreciate the instruction which was offered them. They had not studied up to the point whence their teacher took his departure

They could not comprehend his thoughts, or follow his reasonings. Still less were they able to bring their own judgment and good sense to act upon them with coolness, decision and effect. They are over-mastered by their teachers. Their intellects become parasitic and dependent. They receive strange thoughts without digesting them. They recite subtle reasonings without fully appreciating their reach and application. Or what is still worse, they are confused by speculations which they were not prepared to understand and judge, so far as to lose the freshness and cheerfulness of decided convictions, and to bring away a weakened and diluted understanding. Or they are amazed by an array of historic questionings and of destructive criticisms, because they had not read and thought enough to breast them with a manly and independent rejection. Unarmed by previous knowledge and unstrengthened by previous reflection on subjects of this kind, they listen to the charmed words of some subtle critic, and their faith falters, their judgment is taken captive, and a life-time of vague questionings, of timid faith and unresolved doubts, drags out its painful course; or they yield their traditional faith, unfortified by previous study, to the first bold attack which they are not prepared to resist, and become confessed unbelievers. All this may happen, if the young theologian encounters teachers of a negative type and unbelieving tendencies without sufficient preparation. If they yield themselves to teachers of another stamp, to the intolerant bigots of the orthodox school, they become themselves offensively and irrationally dogmatical in proportion to their incapacity to appreciate the position of those of the rationalistic school whom such denounce and oppose. Their residence in Germany sends them back more irrational than it found them, for their newly intensified dogmatism is founded on less exercise of the understanding and the conscience than that which they carried away. They return to America to strenghten a party, but not to advance theological science or religious truth. They are welcomed as men who have been to Germany and who can speak

with authority upon doctrines and parties, on neither of which they were qualified to pass judgment, because they were prepared by previous study to understand neither. Still another result is possible. The student may ascribe his own weakness or confusion of thought to the obscurity of his teacher, or to the indefiniteness of the science, and having attempted efforts for which he was in no wise ready, he may give up effort and hope together. He may despair of mastering speculative theology and philosophy, and the historical questions which concern the canon, and take refuge in a vague but attractive mysticism and satisfy his sense of deficiency by giving it the noble name of Faith. He will find abundant authority for so doing, in Germany itself. He will find a large class of amiable theologians who have resorted to this refuge in order to save or cut short discussion. He will return home enlarged in his reading, but not invigorated in thought. His writing and preaching, his thinking and his judging, will all assume a new type and be marked by strange phraseology. He will be set down as *par éminence* a Germanizing critic or theologian.

We proceed to prescribe another condition or rule of success. Never be content with your achievements till you can express them in the English language and can weave them into one web with the principles and reasonings which are familiar to English scholars. Many forget this rule. If they find new phraseology they think it a new truth. They do not inquire whether it may not be expressed in familiar English words, or translated into intelligible Anglo-Saxon terms, but they catch the new phraseology as though the new casket must of course contain a new treasure. So tenacious are they of the novel dialect, that they do not even strive to seek out English idioms which are equivalent or nearly so, but either ignorantly or affectedly display on all occasions their newly acquired terminology. Many even reverse our rule, and instead of asking whether the new dress does not clothe familiar thoughts, seek to invest their old thoughts in the

clothing of the newly found language. We do not forget that there is a great advantage in a precise terminology, and that often novelty of phrase may attract attention to unobserved distinctions of thought. Nor do we object to the private use of any philosophical or theological dialect which may serve the convenience of the student. But we do insist that the student should test the clearness of his own conceptions by expressing them in his accustomed language, and that he should apply this test with perseverance and rigor. We do not believe that there are two kinds of thinking, the English and the German. Nor do we belive that the processes and results which are expressed in German, cannot be conveyed in English. The effort may require an awkward and uncouth phraseology, but we are sure it may be successfully made. We are sure it ought to be made not merely from the regard which the student should have for the clearness and satisfaction of his own thinking, but in order that he may guard himself against certain salient peculiarities of the German language itself, when employed for philosophical and theological uses. These peculiarities may be described in a word. They arise from its very richness and flexibility. On the one side it is capable of a precise, abundant and most expressive terminology; and this whether used for physical, philosophical or theological science. It approaches far more nearly to the ideal of a philosophical language than the English. No language is before it in the capacity of easily expressing the distinctions which are made by the exactest thinker. None yield with more plastic readiness to the desire to form terms for distinctions not already expressed. It can be compressed into compact and pointed sentences, and can conduct processes of close and rigorous logic. On the other side it is the most imaginative of all the modern tongues, presenting single pictures with every word and weaving a group of imagery into one artistic whole by a single word-combination. Its pages are literally *illustrated* by the pictures that start from every line. Its margins are *illuminated* by colors that play by the side

of every sentence. In such a language, abstractions can be personified most easily and the most impalpable products of the subtlest logic can become concrete into forms of angelic beauty. Hence in the use of no language, do philosophers more readily become poets. In none do we find so subtle a mixture and interchange of poetry and philosophy. Hence its attractiveness. For what is more agreeable than to look for an abstraction and to be surprised with an image, to toil after some generalized and comprehensive law and to be greeted with a personification? But for this very reason it is seductive and uncertain. The image may withdraw the attention from the abstraction. The personified generalization may play with the earnest thinker like the frolicksome Puck, or when fairly caught in his logical grasp may change his form like a provoking Proteus. We open a page in Schelling and begin to toil up the steeps of thought that lead from nature to God, and lo! it is as though the ladder of the Patriarch were reached from Heaven and the angels of God were ascending and descending upon it. We do not wonder that such a language has seduced its own thinkers, if it be not rather the thinkers who have bewitched the language. In how much greater danger is the foreigner, upon whose amazed eyes are lifted all these splendors, and before whose vision, as he reads, gods seem to be all the while ascending from the earth. Hence our rule, that he purge his eye sight by bringing back his new thoughts to the simplicity and clearness of familiar prose, and translate them into the homlier English dialect. Would that those who have professed to translate books from the German into English, had followed this rule. What a mercy would it have been to our befogged understanding, what a saving of time and of patience to all their readers; what a saving of reputation to the poor Germans themselves; what a saving to the purity of our mother tongue, now burthened by uncouth phrases, *transported* rather than translated, and exciting the wrath of old fashioned thinkers and writers. What a mercy to the disturbed spirits of those philosophers and theologians,

who must often have been moved in their graves for very vexation at the unsightly caricatures that have been palmed off as representatives of their clear thoughts and reasonings. What a relief were it to our theology, also, if certain theologians had followed our rule of translating into plain English, the dogmas which they import, (literally raw material,) and of defending them by the accustomed modes of proof instead of speaking in parables whenever it is convenient, and of dodging the force of an argument by slipping beyond a phrase or a figure. If they had only done this, we should not see so many new fashions in theology. Least of all should we see certain exploded dogmas raised from the grave, and wearing "singing robes about them" instead of the appropriate and offensive robes of the sepulchre from which they have been dragged.

Were their rule observed, it would be hardly needful for us to add another, that when our students return from a course in German philosophy and theology, it becomes them to be modest. If they would diligently practice the lessons which we have ventured to prescribe, it would not be necessary to mention this. It is bad enough that some of us can not enrich ourselves at the fountain of science. It is quite too bad to be too often reminded of our poverty of thought. Too often all that occasions this supercilious demeanor, is the product of gossiping rather than of study and thought. A familiarity has been gained with men and books, rather than with thoughts and truths. It were most unfortunate if the younger school of theologians should be divided into two separate classes, the Germanizers and the Anti-Germanizers, between whom there should be little interchange of opinion, sympathy and feeling. Still more unfortunate would it be if the pulpit should suffer from German studies, in respect of simplicity and directness, in respect of manly reasoning and warm appeals. It need not be so. We believe most earnestly that our theology and our philosophy, our preaching and our practical religion, may gain not a little, if the students who go to Germany go at the right time and pursue wise methods of study.

We venture to add as a prime condition of success, great moral earnestness and warm religious sympathies. The earnestness which is conscientious will cause the mind, like magnetized iron, to attract to itself the good, and to discern the true from the false. Those Christian feelings which kindle into lively sympathy towards all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, will urgently impel a man to scrutinize seductive error, and to discern its imposing sophistry. Seeing it he will reject it, because he uses his intellect vigorously from using it with a pure heart. In this sense only, is that much abused principle true or trustworthy, "*Pectus est quod theologum facit.*

ART. VI.—SYNODICAL CHURCH AUTHORITY.

In the October number, 1858, of this Review, we furnished a historical contribution on Reformed Synods. That our article might be unembarrassed as a historical review, we did not enter into the question of the authority, or divine right, of Synods. We propose now a brief exegetical inquiry into this part of the subject. Where ultimately lies the source of Church authority?

Every investigation of the origin and nature of ecclesiastical government and Church authority must begin with two passages in the Gospel by St. Matthew. The first passage spoken to Peter, reads thus:

And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. (St. Matthew 16: 18, 19.)

The second passage, of precisely the same import, spoken to all the Apostles, is as follows:

Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. (St. Matthew 18: 18.)

Examining the second passage first, we find that these are words spoken by our Saviour to his disciples—those disciples whom He had chosen and commissioned to go forth in His name. Their meaning is fixed and clear from the context.

He is instructing them in regard to the course to be pursued with a trespassing brother. He points out a process involving several clearly defined steps. In the *first* step the offender and the offended stand on a level with each other: "Go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone." If this does not effect a reconciliation, by causing the offender to confess and yield, then, *secondly*, an advantage is allowed to the offended party. It is this: "Then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established." Be established where? At the tribunal involved in the next stage of the process, toward which all these preparatory steps looked. If the offender refuses now to confess and repent, and remains still refractory and incorrigible, the offended has now the advantage of proof. This prepares him for the next step—for the tribunal. "If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church." Here is the last resort. This is his last chance. "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." That is, let him, by the judgment and sentence of the Church, be banished beyond her pale out of the brotherhood of saints, as are heathen and publicans.

What will be the effect of this act and sentence of the Church? Will he only be separated from the kingdom of saints on earth, and no more? May he still claim God and his favor, and bring him an acceptable service in his isolated position?—Can he, thus sundered from the saints, claim the sympathies of God against the judgment of the

Church, and flying to His bosom, cry intolerance and tyranny against the Church? No. God turns away from him to the Church with words of solemn approbation: "Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven!" God will spurn him that spurns His Church. He that shuts the doors of the Church against himself on earth, does, *by that same act*, shut against himself the kingdom of heaven. The solemn sentence of separation, pronounced by the Church, against him who rebels against the divine order and authority of the Church, calls back from the highest heaven the responsive Amen!—"loosed in Heaven!"

This passage teaches us, that the Head of the Church has given to it an authority and power, which He has not given to any one, or any number of individuals, and it defines the extent of that authority.

The theory of ecclesiastical government, as held in the Reformed Church, may be briefly stated thus: The Synod is for it the highest earthly authority. It is the final judge of error in doctrine, and error in conduct. The Classes have only such power as the Synod has delegated to them, and all their acts are subject to the review of Synod. Consistories and congregations have only such power as the Classes have given, and still approve. The Synod is over the Classes—the Classes are over the Consistories—the Consistories are over the members. The Synod is the culmination of authority; and it exercises the binding and loosing power over all the departments which lie beneath it.

Is this idea of Church authority, which places the individual under the power of the general, a correct—a scriptural one? This question we must answer in the affirmative, if the doctrine we have just elicited from the passage in Matthew 18: 18, is in accordance with the word of God. Let us see.

This passage teaches, that the Head of the Church has given to it an authority and power, which He has not given to any one, or to any number of individuals.

It is not necessary to our present purpose to discuss widely the nature of the Church, as the kingdom of God on earth. Our Saviour seems here, to use the word Church as synonymous with the college of disciples. This is evident from the fact, that He speaks to them in the whole Chapter. He fixes this meaning upon the word "Church," when He says that the offending brother shall be brought before the Church, and then immediately adds: Verily I say unto *you*, Whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth, &c. The two allusions seem only to designate different phases of the Church: The first, the Church as *tribunal;* the second, the Church as *executive* power.

It is the Church then, exhibiting its authority in the collective tribunal of its ministers, which has this power of binding and loosing. Some have claimed something different from this. The Roman Church, *on the one side*, has claimed that this power, instead of culminating in the Synodical council, culminates ultimately in one man, as Christ's vicar on earth. This claim they have built upon the first passage quoted at the beginning of our article, where the binding and loosing power seems to be given to Peter: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matth. 16: 18, 19. We need no better evidence that Christ did not intend to confer this power on Peter exclusively, than the fact that He immediately confers the same power upon all. The truth seems to be this: As Peter was the mouth-piece of all the disciples, to answer our Saviour's question directed to all, "Whom say *ye* that I am?" by the confession, "Thou art the Christ," so our Saviour responded to him for all of them, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Sure it is, if the first delegation of authority made Peter Pope, then this second one, by the same logic, made all the disciples Popes—a conclusion we cannot entertain, since it is not only destructive of itself, but positively set

aside by what follows, where He requires "two or three" to "agree." It is perhaps significant, in this connection, that but four verses after this pretended Papal authority was conferred upon Peter, our Saviour found it necessary severely to rebuke him. "The Lord turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of man." This is certainly strange language to be addressed to a newly created vicar.

This claim, then, that this power culminates in one seems to be a false claim. There is, *on the other side*, a claim equally false and unscriptural: It is that which makes this power culminate in the people—in all the members, as claimed in the scheme of Congregational Independency. It is not necessary to pursue this point in the way of single controversy; as both these erroneous extremes will pass away of themselves, if it can be shown that the culmination of power lies between these extremes; not in *one*, nor in *all*, but in the Synodical council of those whom Christ selected and invested with ruling power—that our Saviour spake to the apostles all, and through them to all the ministerial succession: "I say unto *you*, Whatsoever *ye* shall bind," &c.

To this point let us address ourselves.

We will now for a moment leave this passage, as well as our Saviour's times and teachings, and seek for a commentary on this passage in the acts and doings of the apostles, after He had left the interests of the Church in their hands. We may safely assume, that they understood our Saviour, and knew, after He had left them, what their mission involved. If He taught them, that Church authority culminated in one man, Peter, we will find them act upon that principle. If He intended and taught that it should culminate in the people, we will find them acting out *that* principle; and if He taught them that this authority was lodged in them Synodically, we will, no doubt, find them, with humble boldness, assuming and exercising that power.

What is the fact? What say the earliest records of the acts of the apostles?

1. We find that soon after our Saviour's ascension one of the disciples suggested that the place in the apostolic college, vacated by the fall of Judas, should be filled. Did Peter make this appointment? No. For he puts himself on a level with the rest, and says, there "must one be ordained to be a witness *with us* of his resurrection." It is distinctly said, not he, but "*they*, appointed two,"—and *they* gave forth their lots," and Matthias was, by the designation of all these jointly, as expressed in their lot or vote, "numbered with the eleven apostles."

"They appointed—they gave forth their lots"—Who? "The disciples (the number of the names together were about an hundred and twenty.)" Were these just believing brethren, or were they commissioned messengers? It is evident from the scope of the language that they were not the company of the believers in general, but of those that He had from time to time commissioned to go forth and preach in His name. This company of 120 included perhaps those 70 which He sent out two and two, and to whom He said: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." (Luke 10.) These, together with the eleven, and some others which from time to time had been commissioned, would make out the number. That reference is had to these commissioned disciples is evident from the language of Peter. Does he not speak to a company commissioned like himself, when he says of Judas, "For he was numbered with *us*, and had obtained part of *this* ministry. Wherefore of *these men*, which have *companied with us*, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out *among us*, beginning *from the baptism of John*, unto *that same day that He was taken up* from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection. And *they* appointed two."

These men, then, whom Peter addresses, and from among whom, and by whom, this vacancy was to be filled, were such as had companied with the Saviour from the beginning, and among whom He had gone "in and out," in a sense which implies their official relation to Him.

That this company who made this appointment, were those who were the Lord's commissioned, is still farther evident from the fact that in the first verse of the next chapter—where the transactions of Pentecost are related—the same pronoun "*they*" is continued. "*They* were all with one accord in one place"—there appeared unto "*them*" cloven tongues—"*they*" were filled with the Holy Ghost—that is, the same persons who appointed Matthias in the place of Judas, received the miraculous endowment of the Holy Ghost, and spake with tongues. Whether this Synodical council was, as we have sought to show, composed of the whole of His commissioned ones, or confined in its substance to the eleven—the rest only being present—is all the same to our argument. It is perfectly clear that it was neither done by *one* disciple nor by *all* the people. So far, then, we find Church authority lodged in the Synodical council of the Apostles.

2. In the sixth chapter of Acts we have an account of a difficulty that arose between the Grecians and the Hebrews. The Grecians complained that there was partiality shown in the distributions which were made to the poor; and that their widows were neglected. The matter came before the apostles. It was felt at once that the apostles could not take this labor of making distributions upon themselves, as it would take too much of their time from the more important duty of preaching. This can be arranged by the institution of a new office—that of Deacons. Who shall do this? The history shows: *The people may designate but the apostles must invest.* "Then *the twelve* called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, *look ye out among you* seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom *we may appoint* over this business." The people chose the seven, "Whom they set *before the apostles*: and when they had prayed, *they laid their hands on them.*"

In this instance it is easy to see where the power culminates. The apostles direct the multitude to choose men—

the apostles designate the number—the apostles specify the character and qualifications which they must possess—the apostles have the chosen men set before *them*—the apostles say "whom *we* may appoint"—and the apostles impart to them official power, by the laying on of their hands. Here neither the idea of *one Pope*, or of *all Popes* can claim the least shadow of precedent. But here, again, do we find the culmination of power and Church authority in Synodical council.

3. Once more. When Paul and Barnabas were at Antioch, they met certain men who had come thither from Judea, and who taught the brethren there that they could not be saved except they were circumcised after the manner of Moses. Paul and Barnabas had "no small dissension and disputation with them" about this matter. What is to be done now? If there is any where *one* man in whom Christ has vested Church authority Pope or Bishop—let him be appealed to. Or if such power has been vested in the members of the Church, let them be appealed to, and let the matter be decided by the voice of the majority. It seems, however, that the Church at Antioch knew of no such way. "They"—that is, the brethren who had taken up this idea of the teachers from Judea, but who wished now to know the truth in regard to the disputed point—"They determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." What! all the way to Jerusalem! Yes. A sure evidence that the congregation at Antioch did not believe in the judgment of majorities, or in the power of congregational self-rule after the scheme of Congregational Independency. Neither did they know of a Pope whom Christ had made the source of infallible wisdom. But they did know that to Synodical council Christ had given the power to bind and loose.

The rest of these proceedings are all natural, and easy of comprehension. Paul and Barnabas, and "certain other" delegates from Antioch went to Jerusalem. "They were recieved of the Church, and of the apostles and elders."

"The apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." There was "much disputing" on the point in hand. Peter rose up and spoke. He took the ground that circumcision was not necessary to salvation in a Christian; and gave as evidence the fact that God had sent him to the Gentiles that they might be saved—that he had preached to them, and that they had believed and recieved the Holy Ghost without circumcision—that God had thus set his seal to the salvation of the uncircumcised. A conclusive argument. He was followed by Paul and Barnabas, who took the same ground with Peter, and testified that they had labored among the uncircumcised with the same results, and had recieved the same seal of the divine approbation to their ministry. James rose and took the same side, for the same reason; adding the important consideration that God's giving his seal to the ministry among the uncircumcised, had only fulfilled what He had promised in the prophets ages agone.

The reasons given by these different speakers "pleased the apostles and elders, with the whole Church;" and they concluded to send a delegation of "chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas." They sent accordingly, along with those who came from Antioch, "Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren: And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The apostles, and elders, and brethren, send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia. Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us, (Schismatics of Judea) have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom *we gave no such commandment:* It seemed good *unto us*, being *assembled with one accord*, to send chosen men unto you, with our beloved Barnabas and Paul: men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent, therefore, Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the *Holy Ghost, and to us*, to lay upon you no

greater burden than these *necessary* things; that ye abstain from meats," &c. This decision was laid before the Church at Antioch, collected in a meeting for that purpose, and was recieved by them with joy.

Here again beyond all dispute, we have an evidence that the Synodical council was looked to as the final arbiter in congregation difficulties and disputes.

4. There are references and allusions to the same facts, so clearly established in these precedents, in the Epistles. Paul reminds Timothy that he recieved a gift—the gift of ministerial authority—from the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. He had received his commission from the presbytery, or council of elders—this council was before him, and over him, from which he recieved his authority to be an officer in the Church, and to which he was responsible. All this points to the same principle, as those precedents which we found in the Acts of the Apostles—and all this is a plain commentary on our Saviour's words in St. Matthew. To the Synodical council of the apostles, and through them to their proper succession, He says: "Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

The question may arise: If the ministers and elders of Jesus Christ are the repositories of Church authority in Synodical council, do they sink back upon a level with members, in regard to authority, when they are not in such council. We answer no. This power is lodged in the office; and must be recognized and acknowledged there by the laity and by congregations.

That they have an authority which no private member has, is evident from the very names applied to them. Minister—from God to them. Ambasador—one having authority delegated to him. Bishop—or overseer. Elder—one who like an aged person is to be looked up to and reverenced. Pastor, or Shepherd—one who directs the the flock and whose directions they must follow. Watchman—one who is set as guard. All these names place the

minister between God and the people. They are to receive the word from his lips as God's words, and render him, who teaches and rules well, "double honor." Paul acknowledged this principle when he takes back his words to Ananias—words which to any other man would have been proper enough—when he was told that it was "God's high priest." "Then said Paul, I wist not brethren that he was the high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." Glorious magnanimity! It were well if those who make a virtue of bandying about the names and characters of ministers would remember this solemn divine order. They may one day see it written, in letters more terrible than those on the walls of Bellshazar's palace, "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm?" Ps. 105: 15. Our Saviour says, to every one of His ministers, when He sends them forth in His name: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." Luke 10: 16.

The deep divine wisdom in this principle of Church government, and its admirable adaptation to the ends in view, are also apparent. The three offices of Christ as Prophet, Priest and King, He carries on, not separated from those for whose sake He exercises them, but in and by them. In the prophetic office, He teaches by and through His people. In the exercise of His priestly office, He makes His people priests. So His kingly office He carries on, exersising its powers, through and by, His people. The rule is not a power over them merely, but a power in them as well. Not a rod somewhere hidden to be slavishly feared—not a power afar off sending edicts—the authority is as near as the grace, and flows in the same channel.

The highest government is not the mere control of passive masses, but that of self-determining wills—the government, not of bondage, but of freedom. In the government of wills, the power must necessarily be in a degree mutual and reciprocal, between the rulers, as the representatives of God, and the universal kingship—which is ultimately to be realized, (Rev. 1: 6.)—of beleivers as the ruled in whom

it is to effect its gracious purposes. The members designate those who are to bear rule, as is done in every case in the precedents of the apostolic Church, while the ordained, for God, invest with the power to rule, and in all cases, if we may so say, hold the balance of power, so as to hold full, final authority—but hold it, not over slaves arbitrarily, but over freemen in the spirit of freedom. Thus the ruling power cannot be contracted and absorbed into a terrible and dangerous one-will unity (which is tyranny), nor yet expanded and diffused into disjoined multiplicity (which is the principle of anarchy). It avoids the danger, on the one hand, of power disowning freedom, as in the Romish Church; and on the other it escapes the equal danger of liberty disowning power, as in Congregational Independency. The rule is not by *one* man, nor by *all* men; but by Synodical co-operation, where there is first counsel and then power, and where the power of God and the response from men meet and act.

In regard to its ruling power, as in all other respects, the Symbol of the Church is a human body—the body of Christ. The power that rules is not over the members, but in them. The will as being in the head, does not handle the members, as the engine does the wheels which it propels; but it governs them by muscles, nerves, and blood, which it finds at hand in the members themselves. By powers in them, it governs the body. So does Christ govern the Church, by a power in the members, not merely a power over them. The human body, and so also the Church, is as far removed from a monarchy as it is from a democracy. The members do not rule the head, but are used by it. The head rules the members, and yet only by power exercised in them and by them. The body whose members can only be governed by an arbitrary power over them is a corpse, and not a living organism. Nor yet is the true government of the Church republican. Though nearer this, it is on a higher ground. In a republic, men *as they are*, rule by delegates *as they are*. But in the Synodical rule of the Church, though the people's voice and power

enters by representation into the ruling council, yet are the people themselves first enlightened by the pulpit and sanctified by the altar before their voice can be heard. Thus is it at last the voice of a higher power and of higher wisdom, which acts and speaks in them. Moreover the rulers designated by them are those who have not only been farthest advanced in light and holiness—for such alone are allowed to be chosen—but they also receive an investure from a higher power through ordination, which carries with it the warrant and promise of constant divine supervision. To them Christ says: "Lo, I am with you alway, even until the end of the world." They can publish the results of their councils with the words, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us." (Acts 15: 28.)

Thus too, it may be easily seen, that the ruling power in the Church is truly a means of grace; because it is a law working not over man merely, but in them and by them. The use of the keys has with God the honor, and with man the power, of a prayer and a blessing.

If we have established the proposition which we elicited from the passages in St. Matthew then we have ground for drawing from the subject several important inferences.

The Reformed Church seems to have a clear Scripture precedent and warrant for its order of Church government. We do right in obeying Synod which is placed over us, as the final power, and we do well to demand obedience from the Classes, Consistories and Congregations over which it is placed. It ought to be sufficient to us to know that it is a divine order—this is warrant of its goodness. Let us mantain it in good faith.

We may also learn from this subject, what a solemn thing it is to fall under the discipline, censure, and penalty of the Church. There are many who make but little of the anathama maranatha of the Church! They will not hear the Church when it calls them to an account for offences, neither will they repent when its penalty falls upon them. Some even turn round at Church censure in the spirit of fool-hardy independence, with a sneer: "Ye take too much upon yourselves, ye sons

of Levi." Against the growing insubordination to Church authority, and against the growing indifference to Church censures, we lift up the standard on which is inscribed the awful warrant: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth is bound in heaven!" He that is wise will rather fall at the feet of the Church, and implore pardon for his offences, in tears of penitence, than hear pronounced over him that dreadful severing sentence which recieves response from on high—"Loosed in heaven!"

Moreover, what an honor, and incalculable blessing it is to have honorable and worthy standing in the Church, either as minister, elder, deacon, or private member. With these arms of everlasting love around us, who can shake our sure repose. Who shall condemn us, when the whole Church bears silent testimony for us. "Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem!" Housed in this blessed ark, let the world perish! She bears us in her bosom here, as a kind mother bears her child, and points us, with words of sweetest promise, to those bright and peaceful skies to which she will bear our happy spirits at last. Let it be our most ardent prayer: "Keep us in everlasting fellowship with the Church that waiteth for Thee; and with the Church which is in Thy presence!" As long as this fellowship is ours—as long as we are worthy of it, so long will every word of confirmation which the Church on earth speaks over us, recieve glorious response from beyond the stars: "*Bound in Heaven!*"

Lancaster, Pa. H. H.

Art. VII.—CANTATE DOMINO.

CANTATE DOMINO: A collection of Chants, Hymns and Tunes adapted to Church Service, by Lewis H. Steiner and Henry Schwing. Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co. pp. 324.

Of Hymn books there is already an abundance in the American Church. Every denomination has its own; and the Presbyterians and Congregationalists each have several. Why publish another?

Music books, too, are not wanting. The musical world is overflooded with them; each claiming to be better than the rest; yet few, if any, calling forth a warm response from the hearts of the people. The choir sings the tunes for the entertainment of the congregation. Why add another to the number?

If the *Cantate Domino* were one of the many works pervaded by the reigning unchurchly spirit of the age, we might properly dismiss it with a word of dubious commendation, and let it run a race with its numerous competitors for the favor of choirs. But it comes with the depth and glow of another spirit, and challenges our highest regard.

American theology is, for the most part, the product of logical reflection starting with some metaphysical idea, as the will of God or the will of man; and ignores Jesus Christ as the *principle*, substance and end of supernatural revelation scientifically apprehended. He becomes the glorious expedient only by which an almighty Sovereign fulfils His purposes; or the blessed medium by which sinners may be reconciled to God and get to Heaven. Though proclaimed to be "all and in all," He really holds a subordinate place in our prevailing systems of theological thinking. The result is, on the one hand, a religion of reflection, of definite intellectual apprehension of doctrines; and, on the other, a religion of emotion, of states of feeling and frames of mind. Though different and seemingly exclusive, these two forms of religion are nevertheless alike as

to general character. Both spring from a metaphysical idea instead of from Him who is God and Man; and deal rather with abstractions, human notions of divine things, than with divine-human realities, the immediate objects of faith and devotion.

The spirit of this unchristological method of thought, dealing with speculative abstractions rather than with the concrete facts of faith, has wrought itself out, and is bearing ripe fruit after its kind, in all the relations of religious life. It is unchurchly. It denies even the existence of the Church, considered as a supernatural order of spiritual authority and power on earth. It is unsacramental. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are admitted to be signs, but only empty signs; they represent an invisible grace, but no present grace operating efficaciously in and through these ordinances. Modern Calvinism argues consistently from its principle, that the sovereign will of God is not bound in the communication of grace to certain divinely-instituted forms or rites administered by His own ministers. Arminianism argues just as logically from its principle, that the sacramental theory contradicts the freedom of the human will. Starting in opposite metaphysical ideas, both systems, when logically developed, reject the christological doctrine of the Sacraments.

An unchristological theology is also directly connected with the character of public worship. The union of a public assembly of God's people in prayer, both as to spirit and outward form, is the legitimate product of the communion of saints—of a sense of common participation by the Holy Ghost in the life of Christ as the Head of His mystical body. Substitute any metaphysical theory for a sound christology, and public worship becomes the individual act of associated believers, who, desiring to be *free* from the bond of internal and external oneness, approach God independently, each one, minister and laymen, as his state of mind and heart may prompt.

In no department, however, of religious life has the unchurchly tendency of an unchristological theology been

more marked than in the praises of the sanctuary. A living faith in Christ as really present among His people by the Spirit; faith in the Church, and in the communion of saints, has given birth to hymns of lofty praise, in every age of the Christian Church, in which the profound adoration, the humble thanksgiving, the penitential sorrow for sin, and the earnest aspirations after grace, of God's chosen people, have found sublime expression. The product of the genuine spirit of Christian devotion and pervaded by it, the pious heart catches these inspiring strains instinctively, and rises, as in a chariot of the Spirit, to hold joyous communion with God. The most perfect flowers of the sacred muse are ever fragrant and fresh; no matter in what age of the Church they have bloomed, whether in the primitive, mediæval or modern. Such hymns as the "Te Deum laudamus," the "Gloria in excelsis," "Dies iræ," "O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden," "Lobe den Herrn, den mächtigen König der Ehren," "Ein' feste Burg is unser Gott," "Before Jehovah's awful throne," "Rock of Ages cleft for me," "I love Thy kingdom, Lord," and many others of similar character, will be sung with undiminished delight by the waiting Church on earth until their notes of praise are lost in the triumphant shouts of the resurrection morning. They are but the outward forms in which a simple, unreasoning, child-like faith has wrought out its apprehension "of things hoped for" and "things not seen," in the language of holy song. They give utterance to the "powers of the world to come." Hence the true believer in every age responds to them from the depths of his heart. Freely he pours forth his individual longings, joys and sorrows in the very words which, because they breathe the true spirit of Christian worship, are equally adapted to the inmost wants of the people of God in all ages of the world.

Such are the hymns our fathers sang; and such hymns the Church will sing so long as she possesses their spirit. But so soon as a metaphysical theology supplants a sound christology—so soon as an unchurchly habit of Christian

life takes the place of one that is churchly, a sense of contradiction will manifest itself. A churchly hymnology does not suit an unchurchly mind. Yet the old devotional hymns and the old tunes may hold their places in books and in worship long after the peculiar life from which they sprang has died out; for there is a secret power in the classic forms of sacred song which no class of Christians can entirely resist. But as the unchurchly tendency becomes more general and intense, the old hymns and tunes, become less and less congenial, and, with some exceptions, are either changed or set aside; and a different kind of music and hymns are introduced.

This has been the experience of the American Church. For the last decade or two one Collection of Church music has been following another in rapid succession. But they are not what they profess to be. They do not contain *Church* music. The hymn-tunes and anthems are generally ill-fitted for the people and still less fitted for the sanctuary. Light, airy, fantastic, sentimental scraps from the opera, pruned of a few grace notes and cut to suit the measure of "Old Hundred" or "Mear," they lose the beauty which they possess in the concert-room without gaining any of the features characteristic of sacred music. The old chorals, so full of devotional feeling, are very generally thrown aside; or if retained, they are so mutilated in the attempt to adapt them to the times, that they can scarcely be recognized any longer. The result is a collection of hymns and set tunes which, if skillfully sung by a trained choir, may do to entertain an audience for a short time on a Sunday, but are by no means able to bear heavenward the praises of God's people. They are of the earth, earthy.

"Music is a kind of language by which the heart expresses its feelings and emotions. Every style is an embodiment of a peculiar spirit. There is a style suited to the ball-room; another to the battle-field; another to the Church. To transfer to the Church any style which is only suited to the world—on the ground of Wesley's re-

remark, that the Devil ought not to have all the good tunes —is to manifest a total want of true Church feeling. 'Old Dog Tray' and 'Annie Laurie,' however good in their place, can never become a permanent substitute for the hymns of praise our fathers sang. And yet in one form or another they are constantly being substituted. The spirit of song in the Church of the present day is widely different from the spirit of song in the Church of the past. Only think of the tune of 'Katy Darling' or 'Lily Dale,' or the tune of the negro song 'Susanna,' being sung to solemn words in the presence of Luther! and that, too, in the House of God! Why, he would have chanted the old Gregorian strains the remainder of his life by way of penance."

An unchristological theology has begotten an unchurchly spirit. And our unchurchly age has given birth to unchurchly music. This is coming to be more and more felt. The more earnest and pious portion of Christians have not been, and can not be, satisfied with the unmeaning, flippant style of our prevailing Church music, performed, in Romish style, by the choir to the exclusion of the people. And as sounder views of Christ and of public worship become more general, the feeling of dissatisfaction will become deeper and stronger. Already is the desire awakened to revive congregational singing, and return to the old standard airs; and it is steadily increasing. There is a deep sense of the want of a style of Church music, that is higher, purer and more devotional.

The *Cantate Domino*, or Collection of Chants, Hymns, and Tunes, adapted to Church Service, by Dr. Lewis H. Steiner and Professor Schwing, is an earnest response to this general sense of want. And it affords us much pleasure to add, it is as successful as earnest.

The chief and fundamental excellence of the book is, that it proceeds upon the true principle of sacred song. It is objective; not subjective. The objective element is the ruling element; and subjective sentiments and emotions are held in proper subordination to it. All approach to

God, whether in prayer or praise, has its only warrant in His infinite grace. God has come down from Heaven in the person of Christ to miserable sinners; has embraced them with the "everlasting arms" of mercy; and in loving kindness drawn them to His paternal heart. The eye of faith beholds the glory of God. It beholds the eternal Son born of a Virgin, teaching and suffering persecution, working miracles, agonizing in Gethsemane, dying on the cross for the sins of the world, and descending amid the triumphs of wicked men and devils into the darkness of the tomb. It beholds Him bursting asunder the bands of death, ascending to Heaven, sitting at the right hand of God "Head over all things to the Church," and pouring out the Holy Ghost accompanied with many signs and wonders. Faith sees Him who is invisible in His suffering Church, ruling, defending, guiding and comforting her, as the Bride of the Lamb, in all the terrible conflicts and sorrows of her earthly pilgrimage—sees Him presenting her in that great and notable day of the Lord, "to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." Looking thus by faith "at the things which are not seen" as certain and glorious realities, the Christian heart breaks forth spontaneously into singing: "Bless the Lord, O my soul: and all that is within me bless His holy name." "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." The Christian sings of Jesus Christ; not of himself. He sings of the Church, the mystical body of Christ, her sufferings and triumphs, past, present and future; and not of human associations, human experiences, human notions, or the natural world. On this principle the Cantate Domino is constructed. The proper objects of adoration, thanksgiving and praise, constitute the rich themes of its sacred songs. And as these objects all centre in Christ, the person of Christ becomes the ruling idea of the book.

But its objective character does no violence to the claims of the subjective side of the Christian life. Just the reverse. It is the constant beholding of the Lamb of God in

His humiliation and glory, that awakens the liveliest sense of sin and the most earnest hungering and thirsting after righteousness. It is seeing Him, that stirs the deepest depths of the soul. The feelings of the believer are, therefore, never so profound and intense as when Jesus Christ is kept steadily before the eye of the mind. And never does the believing heart enjoy so free, unrestrained, and transporting an expression of all its emotions of sorrow and joy, as when, borne upward in divine strains, it forgets itself, and is lost in the contemplation of the transcendentally glorious *objects* of faith. We find, accordingly, the fullest justice done to the inner demands of the *subjects* of grace by the objective principle as it rules in this new Collection of hymns and tunes.

The book consists of two parts. The first is prepared with special reference to the needs of the new Liturgy published for the use of the German Reformed Church. It consists of the Sentences, inspired Hymns, Canticles, Creeds, in a word, of all those parts of the Liturgy which may be chanted or sung, set to music of the highest order. Indeed the whole work seems to have grown out of the special wants which the use of the Liturgy has created; and may be regarded as the spirit of this new Book of Christian Worship embodied in the form of music.

The Second Part consists of a choice collection of *three hundred and eighteen* Hymns. These have been selected mainly, as was most natural, from the hymnological literature of the English language. The selection is made with fine poetic taste, and nice appreciation of hymnological excellence. A sound objective tendency, as we may call it, rules, with a few exceptions, throughout ;* in full harmony with the Creeds, Canticles and inspired Hymns of the First Part. The Person of our Lord Jesus Christ is the touch-stone of merit. He is Himself the great theme

* An exception to the general catholic character of the Hymns is the *Stabat Mater*, of which we have a translation (Hymn 276) from the pen of an accomplished poetess, the daughter of an eminent Presbyterian clergyman, from which, however, all objectionable features have been removed.

of holy song. Yet contrition of heart, humble trust in the crucified but risen Saviour, hope, joy, heavenly aspiration and all the emotions of the divine life in the soul, utter themselves in most appropriate forms of expression.

To these are added some admirable translations from the old Latin Hymns and German chorals, which of late the great activity in hymnological literature has produced. Among these, those furnished by Caswall and Alexander* are worthy of note. There is one from the Latin, on "The Cross of Christ," by Mr. Harbaugh; and several from the Latin and German by Professor T. C. Porter. There is a rich original sacramental Hymn by Rev. A. C. Coxe (53): "Body of Jesus, oh sweet food." With profound reverence for the past, the Editors combine an appreciative regard for what is good in the present.

Among the contributions by Professor Porter, is a new metrical version (301) of the Te Deum Laudamus, which, for literal rendering, rythm and easy versification, possesses great excellence. We believe that we do our readers a service by giving the Hymn in full.

1. Thee, O God, we humbly praise,
Thee as Lord and King confessing;
All the earth its homage pays—
Honor, power, glory, blessing,
Ever giveth unto Thee,
Father of eternity.

2. All the angels join the hymn,
All the powers of Heaven replying,
Cherubim to Seraphim,
With unwearied voices crying:
Holy, Holy, Holy Lord,
God of Hosts, be Thou adored.

3. Thee, the Apostles' glorious choir,
Prophets ranked in goodly number,
Martyrs robed in white attire,
Praise, and never sleep nor slumber,

* In Dr. Alexander's translation of Paul Gerhard's Passion Hymn: "O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden," (263) we are sorry to see an unfortunate blunder transferred from the new Liturgy. The ninth stanza is printed in two different translations, whilst the tenth is omitted.

Loud their hallelujahs rise
Rolling through the vaulted skies.

4. Father, Thee, the Church doth own,
Wide through every land and nation,
With Thy true and only Son,
Worthy of all adoration,
And the Holy Spirit—her
Everlasting Comforter.

5. King, O Christ, ere time began
In the Father's glory reigning,
Thou, to rescue fallen man
Neither birth nor death disdaining,
Hast to all believers given
Entrance through the gate of Heaven.

6. Seated now at God's right hand,
Thou shalt come as Judge. Before Thee,
When the quick and dead shall stand,
Help Thy servants, we implore Thee;
Make them with Thy saints to shine,
In eternal glory Thine.

7. Save Thy people, Lord, we pray;
Bless Thy heritage forever;
Rule and lift them up alway;
Thee we magnify, and never
Cease to praise Thy holy name,
Through all ages still the same.

8. Lord, this day, from every ill
Guard us till the evening closes;
Lord have mercy on us still,
As in Thee our hope reposes;
All my trust is stayed on Thee,
Let me ne'er confounded be.

The book is a collection of *Tunes* as well as of Chants and Hymns. In this respect it is a return to the old and better custom of our German fathers, of printing music with the hymns—an idea which the English Churches of this country have seized in advance of us. Henry Ward Beecher has adopted the principle in his "Plymouth Collection"—a good book. It is time for the German Churches to be waking up to a sense of what they have lost by allowing a foreign element to rule out a principle so impor-

tant to congregational singing. And undoubtedly they have only *lost* much and gained nothing by the change.

The English Churches* are generally mute. The people have no voice to praise God. And the German Churches are growing mute too. Old and young are disposed to sit and listen with closed lips to a performance by the choir. One cause of this is the fact, that the people have the hymn in their hands, but no music. Many cannot sing, even if they would. Give them music well adapted to the hymns, and congregational singing—so indispensable and solemn a part of divine worship—may soon be revived, with due attention by the Pastor and care on the part of a choir.

The old arrangement has another great advantage over the prevailing one. We get music adapted to the hymns. Each answers to the other; and singing produces its proper effect; for a tune only reaches its true power when rightly "married to immortal verse;" and the hymn, when it finds the tune that brings out its full expression. According to the prevailing custom, what congregation, even with a judicious leader of a sensible choir, is not liable to have the solemnity of worship marred by a tune which, though good, has no fitness whatever to express the meaning of the hymn. We thank the enterprising Editors for reviving an arrangement which is founded in the nature of things as well as on the judgment of our fathers; and must, therefore, sooner or later, assert its claim to general regard.

Of the music we are unable to judge. But we have requested a gentleman of fine musical talent and scientific knowledge of the subject, to give us his opinion in writing, which we subjoin, and commend to the confidence of our readers.

---

* Even our Episcopal brethren—if they will permit us to call them such—though many of them arrogate so much of the true Church to themselves that they do not allow the name to their poor fellow Christians, form no exception to the *unchurchly* practice. They pray daily: "O Lord open thou our lips; and our mouth shall show forth thy praise;" yet the *ecclesia*,—or church—the *assembly* of the people, does not open its mouth in hymns of praise. Generally, the *praise* of God is conducted, as among other denominations, by proxy.

"The *Cantate Domino* is vastly superior to most music-books published in this country. Of course, the best music of the old world is republished here. It is not to this I refer, but to our common books of Church music, the number of which almost every music teacher considers it his special duty to increase. The amount of trash in this form is beyond conception. We have a few really meritorious works. The great majority, however, are utterly worthless as far as regards Church purposes. The hymn-tunes which they contain, are for the most part unmeaning. A single glance at them is enough to produce nausea in any one acquainted with the higher principles of the science. Of melody, there is none, and where anything more is attempted than a combination of the simplest chords, there is no harmony, but rather a series of the grossest violations of laws which are as binding in music, as the laws of language are in poetry. Many of our musical authors seem, to judge from their productions, not to have got beyond the precincts of the country Singing-school.

Not so Professor Schwing. His original contributions to the *Cantate Domino* will bear the closest scrutiny. He shows himself a perfect master of his science. It is not every one who can express his feelings in the form of music. The true musician, like the poet, is born. Of course, any man can string together notes which will have some kind of sound; but in most cases they will be as destitute of soul, as the babbling of the parrot is destitute of thought. After a pretty thorough examination of the *Cantate Domino*, I have no recollection of an unmeaning strain. The music from first to last is of the highest order. Indeed, it is refreshing to turn from the insipid *stuff* so often inflicted upon the musical world, to compositions so excellent as, for example, the three Sentences with which this work opens. They remind me of the noble strains of such masters as Mozart and Heydn in their Masses.

"It is unnecessary to enter into details. We shall simply indicate a few of such pieces as are particularly meri-

torious. 'The Lord is in His holy Temple' is good throughout. The fugue which is inwoven into it is artistic. The fugue,—that is, the constant recurrence of the same theme, in different voices and in different keys,—is a feature seldom seen in our music-books, unless in a selection from foreign composition; and yet it is this which adds so great a charm to the Choruses of Handel's Messiah, for example, or Haydn's Creation. Whilst the unity of idea is retained by the repetition of the same strain, there is a pleasing variety in the change of keys through which the strain is made to run. It is a source of unbounded effect in the hands of a skillful composer. 'Oh! come let us sing' is majestic; the passage, 'For the Lord is a great God,' &c, down to the closing strain, is particularly fine. If well sung, with a full organ accompaniment, it would be magnificent. 'O! come let us worship' may be pointed out for the sweet flow of its melody, which so well expresses the sense of the words. The Apostles' Creed is arranged to be sung. In our judgment, it should, like the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, be chanted. True, the air to which it is set has much of the freedom of the chant; still it is measured, and seems to render the repetition too mechanical. The music itself is worthy of praise. 'Gloria Patri,' No. 1, flows majestically. There is a typographical error, however, in the text. Where the words, 'As it was,' &c., occur, the second time, the prevailing chord is *B flat seventh*, and yet *A*, in the alto, is *natural*, producing an extremely harsh discord, which the ear must tolerate through a whole measure. It is, doubtless a misprint, *A flat* being necessary as a preparation for the chord of *E flat* in the next measure. 'Te Deum,' No. 2, is one of the best compositions in the book. The special emphasis which the word 'Lord,' at the close of the first strain, receives, from its peculiar position, is an artistic touch. But we specify no more. We had intended to furnish a criticism of the Second Part, but deem it altogether unnecessary."

The tunes of the Second Part are the sterling, standard airs of the past and present, all of which are adapted to

the purposes of Church worship. Indeed we know of but few old tunes that are wanting; whilst the unmeaning airs that now so generally afflict the sentuary are carefully excluded.

Some of the music in both Parts of the book is too difficult for the majority of congregations, perhaps for all. This, however, is no objection to the book. A book of hymns and tunes for public worship ought not to come down to the level of the musical ability of the mass of the people or even to that of the majority of choirs; but it should be judiciously constructed according to what is acknowledged to be the true standard of Church music; and then choirs, children and congregations should be educated and trained according to this standard. Just as we train children to read, to say the Apostles' Creed, to repeat the Catechism intelligently, and offer Christian prayers, so should we train them to sing the best music—music that will give suitable, solemn and elevated expression to the manifold themes of Christian thanksgiving and praise.

The principal objection we have to the book is the confusion of subjects in the Second Part. Had the order been followed which is given in the "Index of subjects," it would have gained very much. But it is alleged as a reason for the confusion by one of the gentlemen who have "given most acceptable and valuable assistance" in the preparation of the book, that the necessity of printing the tune and the hymn together on the same page, offered an insuperable obstacle to following an order of subjects. If the reason be valid, it appears that the least of two evils has been chosen.

Taken as a whole, we regard the *Cantate Domino* as a work of extraordinary merit. The music is of the highest order. It is skillfully adapted to different occasions, and to the endless variety of themes of sacred song. The Hymns have been selected on a principle that is purely Christian, and with nice critical discrimination. A living combination of these essential elements, it commends itself to general acceptance among all denominations. So much

of the good and old and rich English, German and Latin hymnology, with the best music of the Christian Church is now made available for the first time to the English public. E. V. G.

ART. IX.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, in Chronological Tables; a Synchronistic View of the Events, Characteristics and Culture of each Period, including the History of Polity, Worship, Literature and Doctrines, together with Two Supplementary Tables upon the Church in America; and an Appendix containing the Series of Councils, Popes, Patriarchs, and other Bishops, and a Full Index, by Henry B. Smith, D. D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary of the city of New York. One Vol. folio. Price 6.00.

This is a work of immense labor, and a *momentum aere perennius* both to the esteemed author and to American scholarship. It is decidedly superior as to fullness of contents and beauty of typographical execution to the German works of the kind by Vater, Danz, Lange, Vorländer and Hagenbach, and also to the Oxford Chronological Tables of general history. It shows what American scholarship thoroughly trained in the German schools, can accomplish. I am sure if the late Dr. Gieseler had seen this book, he would not have written such foolish things of America, as those paragraphs in his last posthumous volume, which Dr. Add. Alexander recently translated for the amusement of the readers of the Princeton Review. Dr. Smith has done good service by his able revision of Davidson's Gieseler, but we thank him far more for this independent work. The last two Tables (XV and XVI) on the American Church History are especially valuable and condense an immense amount of information, relating to all the leading denominations, noticing even our Synod at Frederick, our new Liturgy and German Hymn book, Bomberger's Encyclopedia, Harbaugh's Future Life and Fathers of the German Reformed Church, etc., etc. The Appendix contains Chronological Lists of Councils, oecumenical, provincial, Greek, Roman, and Protestant; of Popes and Antipopes; of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople; of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the bishops of London; the present incumbents

of British and American sees; and the moderators of the General Assembly of the Old and New School Presbyterian Churches down to 1858. We have noticed several inaccuracies in names, dates and facts; but it would be almost pedantic even to mention them in a work of such intrinsic difficulty and such general reliableness. We only regret that the price, although very cheap in proportion to the value, the amount of labor and the uncommon expense of composition and mechanical outfit, places it beyond the reach of the ordinary theological student, to whom it would be of the greatest service as a book of constant reference. As such we commend it most heartily to all our readers who can afford to buy it. We append the publisher's notice, which gives, without exaggeration, a very clear statement of the contents and object of this great book.

"This work is an attempt to combine the advantages of a Manual and of Sychronistic Tables. It is a digest of Church History on the basis of the best treatises, and so arranged as to be convenient for study and reference.

No work of the kind has ever before been published in this country, and it is believed to be the most complete manual of Church History ever published, bringing the subject down to the present time, and containing the matter of several octavo volumes, so arranged as by help of the Index to be perfectly at the command of every intelligent person. It affords advantages of studying History by the Synchronistic method, by which all cotemporary subjects are brought together in their true relations.

The whole History of the Christian Church, ancient, mediæval and modern, is divided into Six General Periods, and subdivided into Sixteen Tables. Each Table occupies four folio pages, with exception of the 14th and 16th, which extend to five. The headings of each Table give, in a concise form, the main points that distinguish the period and the Table. The first column in each Table describes the Characteristics of the epoch; the second gives an outline of its Secular History, and the third is devoted to Literature and Culture. These three columns are an open introduction to the Ecclesiastical History, which is next exhibited in ten or twelve columns, each one of which comprises a distinct department of the history,—the whole Table synchronizing the History of the Church in different countries, and also its Literature, Polity, Worship, Discipline, Doctrines and Heresies.

Two Supplementary Tables are devoted to the History of the Church in America, from its first colonization. This has never before been attempted either in chronological tables or in the general histories of the Church. The history of each branch of the American Church is exhibited with a somewhat disproportionate fullness, in the hope of making a useful book

for ministers and students in all branches of the Christian Church. Here may also be found a summary of our chief ecclesiastical and doctrinal controversies, and a full bibliography of each denomination.

The General Index has more than 20,000 references. The whole work has the matter of four large octavo volumes.

The present statistics of the Church, in all its branches and denominations, are given according to the latest and best authorities.

These Chronological Tables are designed to be not merely a book of references, but also a manual for study and review. Thus, the first column in each Table, read consecutively, gives an outline of Church History under its general aspects and relations. In the same way, the columns on Literature, Polity, Doctrine, and Worship, contain a condensed history of these subjects, complete in itself."

P. S.

THE DIVINE HUMAN IN THE SCRIPTURES. By Tayler Lewis, LL. D., Prof. of Greek in Union College. New York: Robert Carter & Brotners.

Having just received this book from the respected author, we are hardly prepared for more than a very brief notice. Dr. Lewis is an eminent classical and Biblical scholar, and one of the strongest thinkers and ablest writers in this country. His contributions to this Review, though, like angel's visits, few and far between, are among the very best. A new work from his pen must excite attention and will be examined with respectful interest.

The one before us seems to be behind none of its predecessors from the same source. It treats of a subject of universal and vital importance. It is a fresh and vigorous argument for the divine inspiration and authority of the Scriptures from a point of view which is rather uncommon among our divines, but true and important in itself, and better calculated perhaps to meet the objections of modern infidelity than the old fashioned inspiration theory, which looks so exclusively at the divine agency as to resolve the human element in the Scriptures almost into a Gnostic delusion, like the consecrated bread and wine according to the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation. We must believe in the *incarnation*, not only of the living Logos, but also of the spoken Word of God. It has assumed human flesh and blood, has a human body, soul and spirit. But from this veil of humanity shines forth the glory of divine, eternal and unerring truth. The perfect humanity of the Scriptures is a proof of their divinity. In this respect there is a parallel between the true doctrine of the Bible or the written Word, and the doctrine of Christ, the living Word of God. This is

not so stated by Dr. Lewis. But it would be easy to use his book for this purpose. It reminds us of the recent successful attempts of Ullmann (Sinlessness of Jesus), Young (The Christ of History), Bushnell (in the beautiful Christological chapters of his work on Nature and the Supernatural), and others, to construct from the unique perfection of Christ's humanity, in midst of a sinful and fallen race, a strong argument for his divine character. The notes contain some good specimens of exegesis.

P. S.

Poems. By Henry Harbaugh. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1860.

The first poet of the *German* Reformed Church in the *English* language. This is something of an event. Switzerland, the birth-place of the German Reformed Church and of Mr. Harbaugh's ancestors, is itself a magnificent poem, whether we look at the unrivalled beauty of its nature, or the rich traditions of its history. Zwingli was by no means opposed to art, as he is sometimes falsely represented, but was so fond of poetry and music, that the Papists called him the "evangelische Lautenschläger." His wife, after his heroic death on the battle-field of Cappel, gave utterance to her intense grief in a most touching poem. Next to the Lutheran Church, no denomination of Christians has so many and so distinguished hymn-writers as the German Reformed We need only mention the names of Johann Zwick, Joachim Neander (the author of the universal favorite: "Lobe den Herren, den mächtigen König der Ehren"), Louise Henriette, Electress of Brandenburg, (authoress of the celebrated Easter and resurrection hymn: "Jesus, meine Zuversicht"), Lampe, Tersteegen, Annoni, Zollikofer, Pauli, Lavater, Adolphus Krummacher and his son Frederick William, Hagenbach, G. P. Lange and Mrs. Meta Heusser-Schweizer, whom a celebrated Lutheran hymnologist calls the most gifted female poet of the German tongue.

That Mr. Harbaugh had the *ingenium poeticum* in him, was apparent long since to every careful reader of his prose works, especially those on the future life, and on the birds of the Bible. His prose is semi-poetic throughout. We were not a little amused the other day in reading the characteristic notice in the "Guardian," from the pen of his neighbor, our excellent friend, Prof W. N., himself a German Reformed poet, though of Scotch descent, who can say acute and smart things in a very innocent and quaint way. "We were apprehensive," he commences, "that it would turn out in this way. A certain rich vein of feeling and easy flow of imagination had we long ago observed in the prose writings of our author, which we feared, in the end, would burst forth into poetry. A dispo-

sition in him for some time had we remarked, with some concern, to introduce into his essays and other writings, as if merely to illustrate or embellish some of his thoughts, choice passages taken from the best old English and German poets, which, however, showed too plainly what was the natural bent of his mind, and with what sort of writings he was pleased. Nay, in the "Guardian," from its first appearance, little poetical pieces of his own had we been in the habit of observing every month, as it came out, few at first and far between, indeed, and as we thought, inserted merely for filling up some odd spaces; but, at length, we saw them swelling out into whole poems, extending sometimes over several pages. We were not taken aback, then, by this final announciation. We had seen the determined tendency long before. We knew that this would be the end of it."

We confess to a similar want of surprise. The appearance of a volume of Poems by the Rev. H. Harbaugh, was to us simply a question of time. It had to come sooner or later by an unavoidable necessity. The bird will sing, and the poet will write poems, and if he finds a publisher, he will publish also, or others will publish him.

We have before us genuine lyric effusions, some of them of more than ordinary beauty and merit, all animated by a lovely spirit, which associates beauty with truth and goodness and makes this triad the worshipping handmaid of religion. Two or three pieces on page 191, 194, and 55, are fit to go into a hymn book without alteration.

As to originality of thought and artistic execution, the *Mystic Weaver* is the best and forms the ornamental doorgate to this flower garden. The management of metre and rhyme would do credit even to Tennyson, the poet laureate of England. There is music, the music of the mysterious weaving process of history in it, as Goethe says: "How all weaves itself into the whole; one works and lives in the other. How heavenly powers ascend and descend, and reach each other the golden buckets,—on bliss-exhaling pinions, press from heaven through earth, all ringing harmoniously through the All?" The poem, when we first read it in the "Guardian," and then in the "Mercersburg Review," reminded us at once of the *Erdgeist* in Goethe's Faust and struck us as a commentary on the words:

"In Lebensfluthen, im Thatensturm
Wall' ich auf und ab,
Webe hin und her!
Geburt und Grab
Ein ewig Meer,
Ein wechselnd Weben,
Ein glühend Leben,
So schaff' ich am sausenden Webestuhl der Zeit,
Und wirke das Gottheit lebendiges Kleid."

Several pieces, as the Aged Elm, the Roses, the Song of the Trees, betray that deep love of nature and sympathy with its life, which always characterize the true poet. Then we have genuine home-pictures, such as the Summer Visit to Grandpa and Grandma in Lewisburg, while the father sits in the study at Lancaster, anxiously waiting for the "fuss of the omnibus" and the kisses of returning wife and children. Quite a number (p. 21, 24, 29, 49, 110, 166, 196, 230), fall in admirably with the author's well known prose works on the future life, they are *Heimwehklänge* and *Heimathgrüsse*, the songs of a pilgrim who delights to meditate during his journey through the desert, on the beauties and enjoyments of the Heavenly Home, and is sure to get there by the grace of God.

Of the traslations at the close of the volume, we were especially pleased with Bonaventura's Passion hymn: *Recordare sanctae crucis*, which equals in merit the version of the late lamented Dr. James W. Alexander, as published in the Mercersburg Review, and with the elegy of Claudius, the so called Wandsbecker Bote, on the grave of his father, which retains here the touching simplicity and truthfulness of the original. But we can hardly conceive why he should have closed with a translation of what he unjustly calls "the *favorite* German hymn, Im Grabe ist Ruh." It is indeed found in many American, but in no good European German hymn book, and not even Knapp's Liederschatz, which contains over three thousand hymns, nor in Lange's, or in any other larger collection. It can hardly be called a hymn at all; the name of Christ is not even mentioned or distantly alluded to; it is at best a lyric poem, a sentimental effusion on the supposed rest of the grave for all men, such as a Deist or Rationalist could write and endorse. Out of Christ, the resurrection and the life, the immortality of the soul is a mere terror, and the grave of the body the gate to the land of curse. This the esteemed author knows as well as we. But he read the poem through Christian spectacles, when in fact it conveys no more than the delusive comfort of natural religion like the famous "Das Grab ist tief und stille," by Salis, which was likewise received into some sentimental hymn books, and which, as a lyric poem of deep feeling, admirably expressed, is far superior to the one here translated, especially the last stanzas. (we quote from memory):

"Doch sonst an keinem Orte
Wohnt die ersehnte Ruh',
Nur durch die dunkle Pforte
Geht man der Heimath zu.

Das arme Herz hienieden,
Von manchem Sturm bewegt,
Erlangt den wahren Frieden
Nur, wo es nicht mehr schlägt."

Now, we knew Salis personally, we often saw him when a boy in our native place where he resided, and walked about twenty miles to his funeral at Seewis, in cold January, 1834, from mere admiration of his poems. But at the time when he wrote the above lines, he knew, like his friend Matthisson, only the airy and sentimental religion of nature, not of divine grace. As the German hymnology is especially rich in *Pilger-, Grab- and Sterbeliedern*, we confess we would greatly prefer to see another translation at the close of this beautiful volume as a finger-board pointing from the poetry of earth to the poetry of heaven,

Harbaugh's Poems will find a hearty welcome in many families in and outside of the German Reformed Church, and bring spring and sunshine in midst of winter.

P. S.

THE EVANGELICAL PSALMIST: A Collection of Tunes and Hymns for use in Congregational and Social Worship, Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1860.

This beautiful Hymn and Tune-Book was prepared, we understand, by three prominent Lutheran clergymen and offered in manuscript to the General Synod of the Lutheran Church, but on not being accepted at its last meeting in Pittsburg, it is published on private responsibility. We presume that it is a considerable improvement upon its immediate predecessor, which it is intended to supply and complete, if not to supplant. With many similar works which have recently appeared, it betrays a growing interest of the public in one of the most important parts of Christian worship and a desire for a return to the good old system of congregational singing.

Of the literary part of this work we cannot speak as well as we could wish. It may be better in this respect, far better for aught we know, than many other modern hymn books, but it is far from coming up to the true standard of hymnology. It is evidently not an independent critical selection from the primitive sources, but a mere compilation from other hymn-books. The order or arrangement of the contents is illogical and incomplete. We have, for instance, p. 87, under the caption of Works of God, a judgment hymn, and under Providence several morning hymns. No room is made in the Table of Contents for the Christian Festivals, which is certainly doubly objectionable in a Lutheran Hymn Book. There is no section devoted to the Church, but the "Ministry and the Church" together are simply mentioned among the "Means of Grace," and the Means of Grace are made to succeed, instead of preceding the hymns of "Christian Experience."

A more serious defect is the uncritical and unreliable condition of the text, and the absence of the most remote idea of

the sacredness of the original text. We are never sure here whether we have a hymn as it came from the inspiration of the writer to whom it is ascribed. The book may indeed be far superior, in this respect, to the General Synod's Collection which, we are told, presents hardly any hymn in its purity. But nothing short of a return to primitive sources can bring to an end the interminable hymnological confusion which is growing among us every year, as it did in Germany fifty years ago under the reign of rationalism.

We will give a few specimens. On page 52 we have, under the heading, *The Advent of Christ*, the well known hymn of Watts, "Join all the glorious names," which is no advent hymn at all, but represents the glory of the exalted Saviour under his threefold official character as prophet, priest and king. But the hymn, as here given, stops with the prophet, and leaves out the priest and king altogether, thus destroying the unity and completeness of the original hymn. As the work proceeds from the Lutheran Church, we hoped to find a good deal of the Anglo-German element introduced here, but we were doomed to disappointment. We have indeed a few translations of German hymns, but all mutilated. Of the *pentecostal* hymn of Schirmer: "O heil'ger Geist," etc., p. 181, which is here improperly arranged under *Trials*, four stanzas are lopped off like dead branches, and the others transposed. The admirable tune is retained, but under the improper name of Schirmer; it should rather be called Nicolai, who composed it to his famous hymn: "Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern," sixty years before Schirmer wrote his hymn to the same choral. Hymn 95 is falsely called "Luther's Hymn." The tune is the familiar German choral: "Est ist das Heil uns kommen her," by Paul Speratus, and the hymn is a translation of Gellert's "Wenn ich, o Schöpfer, deine Macht," taken, without credit, from Henry Mills' *Horae Germanicae* (No. 1), but likewise mutilated by omitting v. 1 & 4, so that one cannot recognise it from its beginning. Hymn 194 is a mutilation of the late Dr. James W. Alexander's elegant translation of P. Gerhart's noble passion hymn: "O sacred Head now (not *once* as the book changes for the worse) wounded," 5 stanzas being omitted altogether and the rest arbitrarily altered. Hymn 550 is a translation of Liebich's "God ist getreu," taken likewise from Mills' (Horae Germanicae p. 129), but with a serious blunder in the very first line (*Then* he will no'er forsake, for *Them*), and an omission of no less than six stanzas, all of which might have been borrowed from Mills, who gives the hymn complete. These are fair specimens of the superficial and unscrupulous manner in which hymn books are manufactured now a days.

The above are all the hymns from the German. Luther's "Ein' feste Burg," of which there are so many translations, we

looked for in vain. No. 48 is falsely ascribed to Luther; it is from Ambrose and was translated into the German by Sal. Frank. The two series of Miss Cath. Winkworth's *Lyra Germanica*, The *Hymns from the Land of Luther*, *Massie's* Spiritual Songs of Luther, and similar modern hymnological works, not to speak of the large critical collections of Rambach, Bunsen, Daniel, Wackernagel, etc., etc., seem to have escaped the attention of the compilers altogether. But enough of the literary part which we expected to be far superior when we first saw the book.

We can speak more favorably of the musical part. Many of the tunes, it is true, lack simplicity and will hardly pass into congregational use. Music designed for public worship, should be of the most simple character, and never admits of difficult intervals. No melody for the people should pass above D (G clef). Triple time is unsuited to congregational singing, and should not be employed. Next to its great solemnity nothing has contributed so much to the popularity of "Old Hundred" (in this book ascribed to Luther, but certainly older and dating from the Middle Ages) as the fact that its key (generally G) time (2-2) and melody are such that the *people* can sing it. We have the finest examples of good Church music in the chorals in use in the Churches of Germany. Nothing can exceed the simplicity of these admirable tunes; and still they are never feeble, trifling or insipid. They are full of meaning, spirit and devotion. They are the tunes which a devout people will use in singing the praise of the Most High. In the volume before us, we notice a few of this class, pröeminent among which stand 'Old Hundred,' and what is improperly designated 'Schirmer.' Why are not more of them introduced to the American public? Dr. Heiner's recent work, noticed in another part of this number, has made much better use of the rich German sources.

The chants are the most interesting features of the book. They are all that could be desired. Many of the Psalms and primitive Christian hymns, the Magnificat, the Trisagion, the Gloria, the Te Deum, etc., are arranged for chanting. It is to be hoped that they may grow into popular use, and that, in this respect, we may revive the worship of the primitive Church. The anthems are quite excellent; some of them are classic. Our only regret is that they are so few.

The typographical execution, paper and binding, are most elegant and highly creditable to the publishers.

J. B. K.

De Turcarum Linguae Indole ac Natura. Scripsit. F. L. O. Roehrig. Philadelphiae: MDCCCLX. pp. 30.

In this little treatise, written in a happy Latin style, the author sets forth a plea for the study of the Turkish language, which, he thinks, has always been too much neglected. Many languages, independent of their literature, are well deserving of being thoroughly studied on other accounts. To say nothing of the mental discipline required in their attainment, by searching, moreover, into the etymology of their words, a new light is often thrown upon the science of ethnology, and, by examining into the structure of their sentences, is reached a more intimate acquaintance with some of the laws of mind. Hitherto have philologists bestowed their attention almost exclusively upon that family of languages called the Indo-Germanic, to the great neglect of the Tartaric, which, though its literature is not so rich, it is true, yet is its philology equally interesting and important. Upon the study of the Turkish language, which belongs to the Tartaric, no one can enter without coming immediately into contact with some of the characteristics of this family.

Not in its words separately taken, as we meet with them in a lexicon, is the life and spirit of a language to be discovered, of course, but through the various modifications and positions of these as they are used in current discourse. In treating then of the nature and genius of the Turkish language, our writer has not so much to do with the derivation of its terms as with their peculiar modifications and arrangement. From a language, in time, may many of its words fall out, and into its nomenclature may many new and foreign ones be introduced, but, as long as its peculiar modes of inflexion and construction are preserved, its life remains uninjured. These the language cannot cast away, but must sooner perish than suffer any changes in these to be wrought upon it from abroad. Though for eighteen hundred years, in Spain, did the Arabs rule supreme, yet could they not destroy, of the Spanish and Portugese languages, the peculiar structure; nor could the Normans, though becoming one people with the English, ever prevent the language of the latter from keeping its Germanic soul. Though the Turks too owe to the Persians all their learning and hold with the Arabs a common religion, and, of course, have received into their use many of the words of both, yet do they still preserve in their language its characteristic structure.

What strikes us as a peculiarity in the Turkish language, as differing from those of the Indo-Germanic family, is that, in the declension of its nouns, to the stems, which remain unchanged throughout, the terminations, denoting the cases and numbers, so far as used, are added on to them so loosely that

they cannot be said to *cohere* but merely to *adhere*. Not unfrequently are they written as separate words. In the same way prepositions do not stand before their nouns but after them; on which account, rather than *prepositions*, should they be called *postpositions*. Likewise in the inflexion of verbs the stems stand always first and then the various conditions or modifications of the verb, which are very extensive, including not only potential, causal, reciprocal, and passive, but also negative forms, which in our language are expressed by adverbs, or reflexive pronouns separately placed, or by auxiliary verbs, in the Turkish language are designated by certain peculiar syllables attached to the stem itself, in the same loose way as are the endings to the nouns. The infinitive present, for instance, ends in *mak* or *mek*. Take this off and you have the imperative mood, which is the stem of the verb. Between this termination *mak* or *mek* and the stem are to be inserted the modifying syllables. Thus:

	Bakmak means *to observe.*
Negative Form:	*Bak-*MAMAK, *Observe not to.*
	*Bak-*AMAMAK, *Observe able to be not to.*
Transitive:	*Bak-*DIRMAK, *Observe make some one to.*
	*Bak-*DIRMAMAK, *Observe make some one not to.*
Passive:	*Bak-*ILMAK, *Observed be to.*
	*Bak-*ILMAMAK, *Observed be not to.*
Reflexive;	*Bak-*INMAK, *Observe one's self to, &c.*

Thus a conjugation rendered literally into English, as above, would very much resemble a running alphabetical index. In the syntax, on the other hand, every word defining another more accurately is placed before it, with hardly an exception. Not only to the location of adjectives before their substances, of genitives before the nouns they limit, of the object before the verb that governs it, does this apply, but even to the relative, which is preceded by the other words of its own clause, and thus further separated from its antecedent. Without conjunctions this language is very concise. With perfect ease can its words be resolved into their elements, and, therefore, it is admirably adapted for showing us something of the philosophy of language in general and the laws of thought. The writer tells us a great deal more about it in a little space, but having just excited our interest and curiosity he stops short. I fear he has something of the trick of tale tellers about him, who publish in the papers just the first chapter of their tales and then refer us to other sources. If we wish to prosecute the study of this language further, we must apply ourselves diligently to its grammar and lexicon or write for information and instruction to the author. His address is F. L. O. *Roehrig, Teacher of Languages, Letter Box* 2238, Post office, Philadelphia.

W. M. N.

DEUTSCHES GESANGBUCH. Eine Auswahl Geistlicher Lieder aus allen Zeiten der christlichen Kirche. Nach den besten hymnologischen Quellen bearbeitet und mit erläuternden Bemerkungen über die Verfasser, den Inhalt und die Geschichte der Lieder versehen. Mit kirchlicher Genehmigung. Philadelphia: Lindsay und Blakiston. Schaefer und Koradi. Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben. 1859.

It is a coincidence worthy of remark that two hymn-books have appeared in rapid succession in the German Reformed Church, the one in the English, the other in the German language, the one the result of personal energy and enterprize, the other prepared by the authority and direction of the Synods, and both in harmony with the devotional spirit of the Provisional Liturgy. Such a degree of activity looking towards the improvement of public worship, indicates the revival of spiritual life both in the hearts of the people and in the counsels of the highest judicatories of the Church.

This *Gesangbuch* has been prepared by a Committee of the Synod, the Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff being Chairman; and was adopted by it during its late sessions at Harrisburg. The preliminary action of the Synod appointing the Committee evinces the presence of a want in the Church that is not met by the other German Hymn books extant; and the adoption of the book after careful examination is a cordial approval by the highest ecclesiastical authority of the manner in which the difficult work has been performed. It is a declaration that the work is an advance upon similar publications, and well adapted to the present wants of the German Reformed Church.

Coming to us under such circumstances—originated by the Synod, prepared by a Committee combining an extensive knowledge of the hymnological treasures of all ages and languages with patient industry, critical judgment and literary taste, and then formally approved by the same ecclesiastical authority,—the book must commend itself at once to general respect and confidence. We must approach it with the presumption that it is a production of sound christological substratum, deep devotion and general excellence.

The presumption is justifiable. Can it be sustained? The future history of the book can alone give the best answer to the question. Yet the judgment of individuals meanwhile is not out of place. After a pretty careful study of its contents, we venture to say that it will not disappoint the high expectations of the Church. It is a beautiful collection, made on scientific principles, of the best spiritual hymns of the Church; commanding the resources of Christian hymnology in all languages; and governed throughout by a sound christology, comprehensive knowledge, an acute judgment and a refined taste.

We can not characterize this new Collection in detail; but must confine our notice to its principal merits.

The great excellence of the work is that it understands its mission. It knows what it ought to be. A *sine qua non* this. And whilst it is not perfectly what it would be, it is nevertheless what it professes to be. It professes to be a Hymn-book; and such it is; a book of Christian hymns for Christians of the German tongue. One great recommendation at least. It sings of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost: of the Father as declared by the Son: of the Son as the Son of God and Son of Man in one Person—the Alpha and Omega of revelation: of the Church, and of the faith of His people: of the Holy Ghost as purchased and given by the Son to abide in the Church to the end of time, and testify of Him. And it sings of these inspiring themes in the original order of the Apostles' Creed—an order that is not only logical, but also historical and real.

The book is not doctrinal; it is at no pains to define, and argue for, the faith once delivered to the saints; but it has a doctrinal substratum as solid as granite rock. It is not practical; it does not state and celebrate the duties of godly living; but there pervades it an unction of the Holy Ghost which prompts the unalterable resolution to live and suffer for Jesus Christ. It is not hortatory; it is not its chief end to awaken impenitent sinners; but it breathes so pure a spirit of heartfelt devotion to Jesus Christ that impenitence must feel rebuked and condemn itself, and the sinner, touched as by divine power, is drawn gently but in deep sorrow towards the Cross. It is not polemical; it does not defend the faith against the Devil and Antichrist; but rejoicing in the Lord only, it enkindles the joy of the Lord in the hearts of His people, and the joy of the Lord makes them stronger in body, soul and spirit for the conflict with the world, the flesh and the Devil.

The book has other minor excellencies. It is printed in clear type, on good white paper and in most beautiful style. It limits itself to the moderate number of five hundred hymns. No hymn is mutilated. We have it as it came fresh from the mold. The hymns are critically edited; and provided with interesting and instructive historical notes. For all these good things the Church should be thankful to the Committee and the Publishers. They enhance the value of the work as a scientific and literary production.

But we call them *minor* excellencies; not because they possess little value; but because all the value they do possess is derived from the fact that they are entirely subordinate to the true idea and mission of a Hymn-book for the Church of Christ. Such a subordinate relation these qualities sustain at every point. For this reason, whilst they are in themselves excel-

lencies as qualities of a Hymn-book, they are but minor excellencies. That is the chief excellence without which its scientific order, literary accuracy and external finish would be but trifles. It is in truth a *Gesangbuch:* a collection of spiritual hymns taken from every period of the Christian Church. It is a book of humble confession, and devout thanksgiving, and sublime praise, to the King of kings and Lord of lords: the law, contrition, regeneration, justification, good works, the Church, the sacraments, death, the grave, the resurrection, and the final judgment, all unite their various voices, like the sound of many waters, in ascribing honor and glory to the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world.

E. V. G.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY: including Theoretical and Practical Ethics. By Joseph Haven, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary; author of "Mental Philosophy." Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859. pp. 366.

This volume, as the author informs us in the Preface, is the result of his studies while Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Amherst College, and was originally prepared as a course of Lectures to the Senior Class in that Institution. It is intended as a sequel to his treatise on Mental Philosophy, published two years ago.

Like its predecessor, the work now issued is based upon extensive reading in the department of philosophy. The author has studied the history of his subject. He occupies a position in consequence, from which he surveys with discriminating judgment the entire field of Ethics. And he thinks as well as reads. Acquainted with the theories which have successively been developed, he reviews them critically, and adopts his own as the result of independent reflection upon the processes of thought by which the present state of the Science has been reached. In addition to his easy, perspicuous and attractive style, these are great merits which we cheerfully accord to Dr. Haven's work.

The scientific and practical value of a work on Moral Philosophy depends, however, upon the answer it gives to the fundamental question: What is *the morally right?* or What is the *ground* of right? Here the work of Dr. Haven is at fault. Rejecting the false theories of Utility and Civil Law, and also the true one which holds the nature of God to be the ultimate principle of Right, he finds the Ground of Right in the Eternal and Immutable Nature of Things—an assumed principle that can have no objective truth, but, if God be God, can exist only as a metaphysical fancy in the mind of man. For, as contradistinguished from the being and character of God, the nature of

things is neither eternal nor immutable; but finite, mutable and temporal.—If time permit, we shall give this interesting subject a more thorough examination in a future number of the Review. E. V. G.

THE LIMITS OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT examined in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year MDCCCLVIII on the Bampton Foundation. By Henry Longueville Mansel, B. D., Reader in Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalen College; Tutor and late Fellow of St. John's College. First American from the third London Edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

These Lectures of Professor Mansel have arrested the profound attention of the learned and scientific in England and America. The rapid sale of a work on so abstruse a theme indicates, on the one hand, the living interest taken in the conflict of belief with unbelief, of truth with error, in the sphere of philosophy, and, on the other, the ability and power with which the learned author addresses the thinking mind of the age.

The principal aim of the work is to disarm all infidel philosophy, whether rationalistic or pantheistic, of its weapons of warfare against Christianity, not by argument from the Word of God, nor so much by metaphysical reasoning aimed directly at the hand that wields them, but rather by turning the weapons of speculative unbelief upon its own heart, and thus causing every form of philosophy set in opposition to Christianity to destroy itself. To perform so difficult a task with any degree of success presupposes an acute judgment, thorough knowledge of all leading systems of philosophy, profound thought, and great skill in logical argumentation. These essential requisites the author possesses in an eminent degree. Firmly fixed in the faith of Jesus Christ and His infallible Word, and combining the power of original, comprehensive and logical thinking with an intimate acquaintance with the different ancient and modern systems of philosophic speculation, Prof. Mansel has given to the world a production which, as to its main position, will be of permanent value no less to sound philosophy than to Christian theology.

Yet, though it affords us pleasure to unite with others in bearing decided testimony to the scientific and literary merit of the work, we can nevertheless not refrain from expressing the opinion that the entire argument is invalid. The main position is correct: the human reason, because it must think in finite and relative forms of thought, can not by reflection or intuition rise to a true apprehension of the Absolute and Infinite; and can, therefore, not construct a consistent philosophy of the Absolute and Infinite. The attempt, as he affirms,

is self-contradictory, from beginning to end. But the argument by which the author endeavors to establish this position is, we venture to say, not only illogical, but involves also a method of thought which at bottom is dualistic—a metaphysical error which in its legitimate consequences is as fatal to Christianity as Pantheism itself.

At present we can do no more than venture to criticise the *Limits of Religious Thought* in general terms. We propose to take up this learned work hereafter in a more extended review. In regard to the argument we would only add, that it proceeds on a principle of reasoning which violates the Law of Negation—technically called the Law of Contradiction—a primary and fundamental law of thought. If so, it must be false. This principle is nowhere discussed, nor even named; but, every where silently assumed, it underlies the whole process of argumentation. If valid, the logical structure will stand; if not, it must fall.

E. V. G.

Unity of the Scriptures: A Discourse delivered before the Green County, Ohio, Bible Society, at its Forty-third Anniversary Meeting, Aug. 17th, 1859. By Rev. E. E. Higbee. Nicholas & Fairchild, Xenia, Ohio.

A fresh, vigorous, and solid discourse. The entire train of thought is based upon a sound view of the nature, relations and design of the Sacred Scriptures. The argument, however, goes to establish directly the organic unity of *Christianity*, rather than the organic unity of the *Scriptures*.

Mr. Higbee makes the Incarnation the "controlling centre" of the Christian system. We would think it better to say that that centre is the Person of Christ Himself, who was constituted by the incarnation. The incarnation is indeed primary and fundamental in its relations to Christianity; but He who, in virtue of the wonderful miracle of the incarnation, unites in His Person organically God and Man, is Himself the pivot on which the entire system, which is both supernatural and natural, revolves.

E. V. G.

Igdrasil; or the Tree of Existence. By James Challen, author of the Cave of Macpelah, and other Poems. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859.

"Igdrasil—the Ash Tree of Existence—has its roots down in the kingdoms of Hela, or death: its trunk reaches up heaven-high, spreads its boughs over the whole universe: it is the

tree of Existence. * * * Is not every leaf of it a biography, every fibre there an act, a word? Its boughs are histories of nations. The rustle of it is the noise of human existence,—onward from of old."

This extract from Carlyle suggests the general subject of the Poem. The author has a broad theme—that of life or existence under the figure of a Tree. He does not seem to have any particular point of observation from which he surveys the vast organism; but selects topics at will—a root, a branch, a leaf or flower on the great tree—on which he descants in metrical language. The versification is generally smooth; and some of the thoughts are striking; but the Poetry as a whole is ordinary.

The exterior workmanship is a beautiful specimen of the taste and skill for which the publishers are so justly celebrated.

E. V. G.

THE PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA: being a condensed translation of Herzog's Real Encyclopedia. By Rev. Dr. Bomberger. Part X. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston.

The publication of Dr. Bomberger's condensed translation of Herzog's Real Encyclopedia is steadily progressing. Part X carries us as far as *Heliodorus*. Herzog's Encyclopedia is one of the most comprehensive, thorough, critically accurate theological publications of the age. The aim of the translation is to give the marrow of the original; and the difficult undertaking has thus far been crowned with great success.

E. V. G.

ITALY AND THE WAR OF 1859. With Biographical notices of Sovereigns, Statesmen and Military Commanders; Description and Statistics of the Country; causes of the War, &c. By Julie De Marguerittes, author of "The Inns and Outs of Paris," "The Match Girl," etc. With an Introduction by Dr. R. Shelton Mackenzie. With Maps and Portraits. Philadelphia: George G. Evans. 1859.

Very interesting sketches of the principal actors in the Italian War. The book contains also a large amount of valuable information for the popular mind concerning Austria, Sardinia and the other Italian States; but it is not based on any profound views of the great political question that is agitating the five Powers.

E. V. G.

ANNA CLAYTON; or The Inquirer after Truth. By Rev. Francis Marion Dimmick, A. M. Phil. Lindsay and Blakiston, 1859, pp. 427,

This work, in the form of a tale, is devoted to the discussion of a theological question, namely, Baptism. Though written in a popular and easy style, it is earnestly controversial, and enters at all points into the questions at issue between Baptists and Pedo-Baptists. Several popular works, in a similar vein, have been published during late years by Baptist authors; and to these this book is intended to be an antidote from the other side. An extract from the Preface will give the reader the best idea of the immediate occassion, and the nature of the work. "The arguments contained in this work," says the author, "were mainly presented in a series of letters to a sister —Mrs. Diantha Dimmick Reynolds—who was then unsettled on the subjects herein discussed and was seeking how to know the Bible truth of the matter. She was flooded with Baptist documents but was unwilling to endorse their views until she had carefully and inteligently investigated the whole subject. She requested me to come to her assistance in meeting and examining the arguments and doctrines laid before her." The author did so—she was convinced by the views and arguments presented—and with her aid, they have been popularized and finally presented in this present treatise. It looks strange to see a book, which is in all respects a tale, richly sprinkled with Hebrew and Greek words and sentences; and yet even the unclassic reader will get a long pleasantly, as the English is always given. The nature of the subject required this sprinkling of the learned.

From its own stand-point the discussion is able. Any one who desires to examine this controversy, will find in this book a compact presentation of the arguments in favor of infant Baptism, and the objections usually made to it answered. It contains also a discussion of the subject of close communion.

With the author's views of the substance of baptism we have no sympathy. To us it seems strange that any one who does not believe that the sacrament bestows what it represents, can have zeal and spirit enough to contend for any form of it through hundreds of pages. It is a most sadly significant fact that, whilst we have shelves of books on the form of Baptism, we have scarcely a singly treatise on its substance and grace. Is not this fighting for the shells while the kernal lies untouched: and what is strangest of all is that this absence of all taste for the kernal is set forth as the very essence of all spirituality. But it is consistent; for the spirit separated from the body is properly regarded as a ghost to be feared We have not so learned Baptism—not from the holy Scriptures, not from the Fathers, not from the Reformers, Swiss, German, Dutch, French,

or English, nor yet, we may add American. We have not so learned it from the Augsburg Confession, Heidelberg Catechism, Thirty Nine Articles, Westminister Confession, or any other respectable symbol, or form of sound words. We observe with pain that as views of Baptism are new, they are ever worse. Who will re-introduce the whole question as to the subjects and mode of Baptism, with a work on its substance and grace?

Leaving out of view this, to our mind, serious defect, we must add, that the author writes in a clear and vigorous style, and presents his matter threaded on an interesting story which allures the reader very pleasantly along through even the most abstruse discussions. The book is very neatly done up by the enterprising Publishers, Lindsay & Blakiston, Philadelphia—a house whose style of publications is deservedly popular.

H. H.